THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIV MARCH, 1932 No. 141

EDITORIAL

We publish below two articles on Confirmation which have particular interest in view of recent discussions in Convocation. Dr. Burton Scott Easton is Professor at the General Theological Seminary, New York, and is known on both sides of the Atlantic as an eminent New Testament scholar. Professor A. E. Morris is on the staff of St. David's College, Lampeter; and our readers will remember the articles on "Confirmation and South India" which he contributed to this journal in January and February, 1930. There are features in both articles, particularly in the second, which we cannot ourselves endorse; but they represent two interesting, and entirely independent, surveys of the facts, and serve at least to show how difficult it is to dogmatize on the subject of Confirmation.

Dr. Easton's article is an example of the application of modern critical methods to the three passages in the New Testament which are commonly held to throw light on the origin of Confirmation and on its relation to Baptism. The upshot of his enquiry is that water-Baptism and Spirit-Baptism (without water) existed side by side in the primitive Church, the latter being closely connected with the visible symptoms of ecstasy. In the Pauline-Johannine theology water-Baptism was held to confer the gift of the Spirit; but in St. Luke's view the effect of Baptism was retrospective, and consisted in cleansing the convert from past sin, while the positive gift of the life-giving Spirit was conferred through the Laying-on of Hands. We owe it to St. Luke, therefore, that the two rites were combined into "the great Christian rite of Initiation" so powerfully described by Dr. N. P. Williams in *Essays Catholic and Critical*.* Broadly speaking, the East has followed the Lucan view, the West the Pauline-Johannine; with the result, Dr. Easton says, that in the West it is taught that "all Christians should receive the Spirit *twice*, once in baptism and again in confirmation;

* *Cf.* especially pp. 374 *ff.*, 407 *ff.*

a doctrine that the Council of Trent made official for Roman Catholics." He adds that this doctrine "has no New Testament support whatsoever."

It is at this point, it seems to us, that Professor Morris's article has an interesting bearing on Dr. Easton's, though his approach is doctrinal rather than critical. The core of Professor Morris's problem lies in the question, What is bestowed in Confirmation? He insists first that it must be not a "gift" of the Spirit, but the Spirit whole and entire: he thinks that the language which associates Confirmation with the bestowal of any special or further "gift" or "gifts" of the Spirit is misleading. But that is not the whole difficulty: for was not the Spirit conferred in His entirety at Baptism, and indeed even before Baptism? Professor Morris answers in the affirmative; and his logic carries him on to a doctrine both of Baptism and of Confirmation—indeed, of the sacraments generally—which makes them simply didactic symbols. The Holy Communion, he says, "fosters subjective awareness of the indwelling Christ": Confirmation causes the candidate to "become subjectively more aware of the power of the Spirit who already indwells him."

We suspect that a proper examination of the extremely subjectivist doctrine of the sacraments at which Professor Morris arrives would carry us off into a discussion of Jansenism: it is at any rate impossible here. But we will make certain comments.

1. Both Dr. Easton's and Professor Morris's arguments seem to need—and to need just at that point where they touch most closely—precisely that conception of "gifts" of the Spirit which is in point of fact plainly taught by St. Paul. What real difficulty is there in the idea of *χαρίσματα*—*i.e.*, of particular grace-gifts imparted by the Spirit for particular purposes? And the gift imparted by the Laying-on of Hands would seem to be clear: it is that of delegated authority, implying at once fellowship and responsibility. It is precisely such a gift that the Christian converts at Samaria needed. They had inherited a long history of severance from Jerusalem, which would tend to reproduce itself in schism from the Jerusalem Church. The gift of the Spirit which they needed was that of responsible fellowship in the new Israel over which the Apostles presided. And it is this same gift which the candidate for Confirmation still needs, and of which the Laying-on of Hands is the effective symbol.

---

2. The effective symbol: we cannot for a moment doubt the reality of the gift. Nor can we accept the dilemma which so puzzles Professor Morris, and in a lesser degree Dr. Easton. The previous interaction of the Holy Spirit and the human soul—an interaction which may well be prior to Baptism, and, indeed, in the case of adults desiring it, must be so (for it is He who gives them the desire)—is no bar to the bestowal of particular gifts of the Spirit at particular times or for particular purposes. And there is a further point to be remembered. It is not so much "awareness" of the Spirit's presence, but *obedience* to Him which Confirmation evokes. The will—or what the Scriptures call "the heart"—rather than the consciousness is the true sphere of His operations. And this responsive obedience of the heart is itself a gift of the Holy Spirit.

3. We published in September of last year an article by Mr. W. Spens, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which has a close bearing on our present problem. We cannot here summarize the article, but must be content with referring our readers to it. But we believe that the conception of sacramental causality discussed in the first part of that article will be found to dispose of many of the difficulties which Professor Morris feels.

In view of all these considerations, wise men will hesitate to dogmatize upon Confirmation. The Anglican requirement of Confirmation implies that it will be the normal concomitant of Baptism, and that in a sense Baptism suffers from a certain defect without it. This is the view reflected in the Acts of the Apostles, and not improbably in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and it is at least arguable that Baptism as understood by St. Paul included the laying-on of hands. Be that as it may, the rule which requires Confirmation as an indispensable preliminary to Communion belongs to human, not to divine, law; and there would seem to be no adequate ground for making the lack of Confirmation a bar to Communion in cases of necessity. If even so much could be agreed on, perhaps the fog of controversy which has come to surround the Bishops' Convocation resolutions might be dispelled, and we could begin to discuss them on their merits.

THE PROBLEM OF CONFIRMATION

In studying the New Testament teaching regarding the gift of the Holy Spirit, there is a primary consideration to be borne in mind that moderns often forget. The first Christians shared with the Jews the usual Old Testament belief that the presence of the Spirit is normally accompanied with ecstatic phenomena, about whose presence or absence there can be no manner of doubt. This is the invariable assumption in Acts; in viii. 18, Simon could *see* that through the laying-on of the Apostles' hands the Spirit was given; Luke here deems it needless to explain that what Simon saw were the manifestations detailed in x. 46 and xix. 6. In other words, in the earliest ages of the Church the presence or absence of spiritual endowment was determined by direct observation; if neophytes exhibited ecstasy, they possessed the Spirit;* if no ecstasy appeared, the Spirit had not yet been received. In most cases, no doubt, converts could scarcely have been expected to rise frequently to ecstatic heights—a constant ability to speak with tongues or to prophesy was a special charisma—and attention was bent toward cultivating spiritual activity in less abnormal forms.† Yet no one could claim recognition as a full Christian until he or she had manifested ecstasy at least once, if only in the first passionate utterance of the Lord's Prayer that followed admission.‡

The initial appearance of this ecstasy, accordingly, was regarded as of crucial importance, since it was at that moment that the gift of the Spirit was thought to be bestowed and made the permanent possession of the believer. And, as we might expect, these initial experiences made their appearance under very varying circumstances. In Acts x. 44 an expectant audience listening to a stirring missionary address§ is seized with enthusiasm and bursts forth into shouts of rapture. In iv. 31 a similar occurrence takes place among a congregation united in zealous prayer,‖ and the same is understood in ii. 1. In none of these cases is any ceremony employed to bring the Spirit: "the wind bloweth where it listeth." A further example of the same immediate gift is found in xviii. 25, where Apollos's

* Later, however, it was recognized that ecstasy might be due to diabolic inspiration, so that by itself it was no sure test (1 Corinthians xii. 3, etc.).

† Galatians v. 22 *f.*, etc. ‡ Romans viii. 16-17; Galatians iv. 6.

§ Naturally much more vivid than the conventional summary given in Acts x. 34-43.

‖ This is, to be sure, not an initial appearance of the Spirit for these disciples, but the principle is the same.

ability to speak and teach is derived from his being "fervent in the* Spirit."

When a ceremony was employed to confer the Spirit, the explicit language of Deuteronomy xxxiv. 9 made the imposition of hands the obvious rite. It so appears before baptism in Acts ix. 17-18 and after baptism in viii. 17 and xix. 6; in the latter two passages Luke's circumstantial language shows that he regarded this as the normal procedure. But xix. 1-7 is not quite homogeneous. When St. Paul learns that the Ephesine disciples have not received the Spirit, he does not ask if the proper hands have been laid upon them; his question is: "Into what then were ye baptized?" It has, indeed, often been assumed that the question takes for granted so close a union of Christian baptism with the imposition of hands that one necessarily includes the other. Acts viii. shows, however, that such was not the case in the first century; under quite normal circumstances the two rites might be separated by a considerable space of time, or, as in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, the second might be postponed indefinitely. It is a preferable assumption that in xix. 6 the phrase, "when Paul had laid his hands upon them," is Luke's gloss to bring the passage into accord with chapter viii.; the original account reading: "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus; and the Holy Spirit came upon them and they spake with tongues." In this way verses 5-6 form the sequel to verse 2. And the teaching agrees with the natural sense of ii. 38, where remission of sins and reception of the Spirit are given as the result of baptism, without mention of a further ceremony.

Any uncertainty attaching to Acts xix. 1-7 and ii. 38, however, is cleared up when the Pauline evidence is examined. That St. Paul nowhere mentions the imposition of hands as a Christian usage in the reception of converts is well known, but it has been frequently argued that his language need not exclude it; he may have taken it for granted as a familiar part of baptism. But this theory is untenable. In Pauline phraseology "possession of the Spirit" and "being in Christ" are the same thing; so identically the same thing, in fact, as occasionally to make his language somewhat confusing.† In Romans vi. 3-5 he speaks of the mystical union as the result of baptism in its three stages of immersion, submersion, and emersion; with the last the union is complete, and "we are united to him by the likeness of his death." Any further

* The Greek here has the article. The usual translations have been influenced by a supposed parallelism with xix. 1-7, although Luke seems deliberately to have set side by side two different types of the Baptist's disciples.

† *E.g.*, 2 Corinthians iii. 17-18.

ceremony after this would have been otiose; St. Paul not only fails to mention imposition of hands as a reception usage, but definitely excludes it. As he conceives it, the Spirit is normally* given in baptism and in baptism alone. We have therefore a real right to recognize a similar conception in the passages of Acts cited above.

In the first days of Christianity, accordingly, there was no uniformity in receiving the initial gift of the Spirit. Some converts grew ecstatic as the result of preaching and prayer, others when hands were laid upon them, and still others when they emerged from the baptismal waters. With any of these experiences—and quite possibly with still others as well—the Church was perfectly content; the indisputable presence of the Spirit was all that was required. If the evidence in the case of Apollos was analyzed correctly above, the Christian missionaries were concerned only with the fact that he possessed the Spirit, and not with how or where he had acquired the priceless gift.

Now, the facts just collected offer no difficulty to anyone at all familiar with ecstatic phenomena. The first Christian converts reacted to the emotional tension of conversion exactly as converts of any age have reacted to the same emotion. Any revivalistic evangelist can parallel abundantly these apostolic occurrences from his own experience. Anyone who has attended a capably conducted revival has seen how the preaching or prayer will lead to outbursts of penitence or thanksgiving; outbursts that frequently grow hysterical and incomprehensible. In certain modern sects, revivals are concluded with a massed baptism of all who have professed conversion, and at this baptism the same lack of restraint reappears—or appears for the first time. If imposition of hands were common among revivalists —for some reason or other it is not—similar phenomena would inevitably accompany it.

The application of this to the apostolic age is obvious. Often converts displayed ecstasy before their final admission into the Church, and these men offered no further problem. Such cases, however, were not the rule, and so in most instances the ecstasy was awakened by the emotional solemnity of the initiation ceremonies, particularly as converts were evidently warned in advance that unless they manifested the supernatural presence of the Spirit they were not acceptable. As to the—in this sense—vital part of the initiation, the first practice varied. In some Christian circles the imposition of hands was emotionally construed, in others baptism. But in either case

* Perhaps not invariably; compare Galatians iii. 2 and (probably) 1 Corinthians xiv. 25.

the experience of converts would conform to what they were taught to expect; modern evangelists have surprising success in awakening in their disciples emotions that conform exactly to some accepted scheme.

The origin of this diversity in practice lies so far back in the earliest Christian history that attempts at explanation must be extremely tentative. But the essential fact is that baptism is not quite a wholly primitive Christian usage. Luke, to be sure, represents it as commanded by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost,* but in the next verse he also represents Peter as proclaiming the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles. In the present texts of Matthew xxviii. 19, baptism is ordained by the risen Christ, but—apart from textual doubts—the trine formula shows that the passage is late. The Fourth Gospel goes even further, and makes baptism originate in Christ's lifetime,† but this assertion is afterward qualified in the Gospel itself.‡

Against this testimony must be set a statement in which all the Gospels§ and Acts‖ unite when they contrast the followers of the Baptist with the followers of Christ; the former were baptized with water, the latter with the Spirit. This contrast is plain and must not be obscured. It parallels a baptism in which water was used with a baptism that conveyed the Spirit; it does not parallel two water-baptisms with different fruits. In other words, in the "Spirit-baptism" of the first period water was not employed.

It is in accord with this that Luke pictures the first Jerusalem Christians in Acts ii. They had never received water-baptism from Jesus nor was any administered to them subsequently; the Spirit-baptism was all-sufficient. But these "hundred and twenty" by no means accounted for all Jesus' original disciples. There were hundreds more¶ in Galilee and elsewhere of whom the same must have been true; what Luke tells of Jerusalem can only be typical of what was happening all over Palestine. And we can scarcely believe that any different rule was applied to the very first post-Pentecostal converts; to the earliest believers possession of the Spirit was a sure foretaste of the world to come, and whoever possessed that gift possessed everything. How soon a ceremony was employed to ensure the Spirit's presence we naturally cannot tell, but the existence in the Torah of Deuteronomy xxxiv. 9 could have produced its effect at any time; every Jew knew the verse. So it is altogether conceivable that—in some congregations, at any rate—the imposition of hands was introduced earlier than was baptism.

* Acts ii. 38; compare verse 41. † John iii. 5, 24. ‡ John iv. 2.
§ Matthew iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John iii. 33. ‖ i. 5.
¶ 1 Corinthians xv. 6.

The problem of the origin of Christian baptism will probably never be solved satisfactorily. That its date was very early cannot be doubted, for St. Paul, in Romans, although writing to a non-Pauline church, assumes as axiomatic that all his readers had been baptized.* We may conjecture—we cannot do much more than conjecture—that John's baptism was the determining factor. This baptism had been so widely received by the Jews that in all likelihood nearly or quite all of Jesus' disciples had submitted to it.† We must not forget here that John's rite was believed to possess a genuine objective value; it conveyed remission of sins,‡ and Jesus Himself taught that it was "from heaven."§ So, after Pentecost, convets to Christianity who had been thus baptized might very well be judged at first to be practically in the position of the original disciples.‖ But when would-be converts presented themselves who had not obeyed John, the question was bound to be asked: "Should not these receive the rite which not only other Christians but Jesus Himself underwent?" And when once the question came to be asked, the answer was bound to be in the affirmative.

When this stage was reached, it appears to moderns that some attempt must have been made to define as closely as possible the exact meaning and benefits of the sacrament, but to Jews—and the first Christians were wholly Jews—such an analysis would have seemed supererogatory. In Jewish thought the sacredness of a rite depends simply on its divine institution: "All these things are to be done because of the commandment."¶ It is enough that God's law is known; its meaning is relatively immaterial. This principle was stated in classic form by R. Jochanan ben Zakkai (d. *ca.* A.D. 85): "Obedience to the law is necessary because it is an ordinance of the King of kings. God has said, 'I have made a statute, I have commanded an ordinance; no man is justified to transgress my ordinance.' For it is written, 'This is the statute of the law which the Lord has commanded.'"** Rabbis, indeed, might—and frequently did—indulge in elaborate explanations of the supposed meanings of ritual commandments. But they might also decline to discuss the matter as profitless, or might even declare roundly that these commandments have no meaning at all; R. Jochanan prefaces the citation just made by asserting that "Death does

* Romans vi. 3-5. It may be, to be sure, that his information was not precise or it may be that what was true of Rome was not yet universally true. Certainly many of the original disciples, who never experienced Christian baptism, were still alive.

† Luke vii. 29. ‡ Mark i. 4, etc. § Mark xi. 30, etc.

‖ Acts xviii. 24-28. It is not easy to understand that "they expounded the way of God more accurately" as meaning "they baptised him."

¶ Sirach xxxv. 5. ** Pesiq. 40*b*; citing Numbers xix. 2.

not defile nor does water cleanse." In any case the Rabbinical opinions on such matters had no binding force; they remained always only the speculations of individuals.

Christians, accordingly, had no precedents to guide them in forming a sacramental theology, and were even unaware that a sacramental theology could ever be regarded as essential. Certain facts, of course, were too obvious to miss. The primary meaning of the imposition of hands was—very exceptionally—specified in clear Old Testament language. And the primary meaning of baptism was unmistakably a cleansing. All Luke did was to combine these two elementary concepts in order to reach his own theory in Acts viii.; baptism is only a cleansing and confers no positive gift, while the imposition of hands endows the person prepared for it by the cleansing.

But in Pauline thinking the reconstruction is different. As Luke saw things, a convert who had professed faith was not yet quite a Christian, and he did not become one until he had received the sacraments. To St. Paul, however, the profession of faith was the crucial step: at that moment the convert was "justified" and his sins were no longer imputed to him. So, since no guilt remained that needed removal, the cleansing effect of baptism in the Pauline Epistles is reduced to breaking the power of the "old man."* The real emphasis on baptism is consequently positive, and centres in the union with Christ; it is from this union, in fact, that the death of the former nature is deduced. Hence the imposition of hands disappears.

Now it is needless to say that St. Paul never worked out this theory from abstract considerations; we can explain it only by recognizing in it his reflection on his own conversion experience. In his first days of solitude at Damascus† he already felt at peace with God through his self-surrender to Christ; he was "justified by faith." But his baptism by Ananias raised him to ecstasy.‡

Baptism, accordingly, was certainly practised by the Christians of Damascus at the time of St. Paul's conversion. Very few Jews of the Diaspora could have heard the Baptist—St. Paul certainly did not—and so practically all extra-Palestinian converts to Christianity may have been regarded as in need of a cleansing rite. But, since baptism administered by Christians was a ceremony of initiation into the Spirit-filled community, it would have been wholly natural for converts

* Romans vi. 6; Colossians ii. 11. Acts xxii. 16 is Lukan, not Pauline, despite the fact that it is placed in the Apostle's mouth.

† Acts ix. 9.

‡ The text of Acts ix. 17-19 may actually be understood in this sense, by understanding the imposition of Ananias's hands as giving only physical healing.

to manifest spiritual gifts at their reception; at all events St. Paul's teaching shows that such gifts were regularly manifested.*

The tradition of Jesus' own baptism would reinforce this point of view; since the Spirit was poured forth on Him as He was coming up out of the waters, Christians would naturally construe similarly the effect of baptism performed in His name. So John iii. 5 couples together "water" and "the Spirit" as the simultaneous cause of regeneration, and the same is likewise true of Titus iii. 5. And the expansion of the baptismal form from the "Christ" to the trine form bears testimony to the same belief, for a rite performed "into the name of the Spirit" would have been meaningless if the gift of the Spirit were not conveyed. It is in accord with this that the Didache, which uses the trine formula, makes no provision for the imposition of hands.

For the Lukan theory of baptism the early evidence is comparatively slight, since it is only in Hebrews vi. 2 that we hear of imposition of hands as an initiation ceremony. The scanty evidence preserved to us, however, may represent inadequately the real prevalence of the doctrine, while in any case the publication and reception of Acts familiarized the Church everywhere with the Lukan procedure and made it authoritative. Yet acceptance of the Lukan ceremonial was by no means universally accompanied by acceptance of the Lukan baptismal theology. In large parts of Christendom the belief that baptism conferred the Spirit could not be dislodged; it was too firmly fixed in tradition and experience, and it had, moreover, too explicit support in the New Testament outside of Acts and Hebrews. Where such was the case the meaning of the imposition of hands could only be conjectured.

The first liturgical confirmation prayer preserved to us—that of St. Hippolytus†—shows the difficulty that was felt. After the baptism, where the (expanded) trine formula is accompanied with a trine immersion that emphasizes separately the Spirit's action, the bishop, laying his hands on the neophytes, prays: "O Lord God, who hast made them worthy to merit remission of sins by the laver of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, pour on them thy grace that they may serve thee according to thy will." In baptism there have been conferred already remission of sins, regeneration and the Spirit; this—a virtual citation of Titus iii. 5—is the familiar Pauline-Johannine doctrine. After this the new boon sought is an anticlimax, since the gift of the Spirit fully includes every grace to live a

* So we may perhaps argue that in Palestine imposition of hands came first, but outside of Palestine, baptism.

† Connolly's *Egyptian Church Order*, p. 185.

holy life. Hence, while the ceremony is derived from Acts viii., its meaning—if it really has any—has nothing to do with Luke's teaching.

This lack of clarity in St. Hippolytus is representative of that which maintains among most Patristic writers on confirmation, and classifying the teaching of the Fathers on the subject is notoriously difficult. Among Eastern theologians, however, the Lukan doctrine came generally to prevail, with the result that in the East confirmation and baptism are all but inseparably connected; only an extreme emergency can disjoin the two. This theory gives to confirmation so unmistakable a meaning, and so obviously reproduces the clear language of Acts viii., that it has found influential supporters in the West; Canon A. J. Mason's *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism* (1891), for instance, is still worthy of the most respectful study.

In the West, on the other hand, the Pauline-Johannine doctrine of baptism became the fixed tradition, and it is set forth by the Western baptismal liturgies; in them all (I believe) there is an explicit prayer that the child shall receive the Spirit. The separation that took place between confirmation and baptism during the Middle Ages heightened this conviction, for it was unthinkable that Christian children were not cared for by the Spirit until their confirmation. This liturgical practice then reacted on the doctrine and produced a corresponding theory; as confirmation was not normally administered until years of comparative maturity, it was held to bestow gifts appropriate to maturity. The upshot was the belief that all Christians should receive the Spirit *twice*, once in baptism and again in confirmation; a doctrine that the Council of Trent made official for Roman Catholics. As a doctrine it is lucid and practical. But it has no New Testament support whatsoever.

Roman Catholic scholars, consequently, find confirmation an exceedingly difficult and obscure subject. Dr. T. B. Scannell, for instance, writing in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*,* says: "There is much uncertainty as to the doctrine concerning confirmation." The conviction that " the sacrament is validly and lawfully administered in the church . . . does not solve the theological questions regarding its institution, matter, form, and minister."

From any New Testament basis, in fact, these questions are insoluble. Just so long as we hold the Pauline theory of baptism—to which every Roman or Anglican baptismal liturgy commits us—we cannot possibly combine with it the Lukan theory of the imposition of hands. Confirmation under these circumstances can be described as an " apostolic rite " only in

* IV., p. 216 (1908).

the sense that it is a rite which Apostles practised. But not all the Apostles practised it. And *no* Apostle practised it who held our theory of baptism; no Apostle thought or could think of a division of the gift of the Spirit between two ceremonies conveying different graces needed by all believers.

Confirmation as we know it has become a solemn benediction of adolescence—early or late—which we know to have a deep value. We may be well assured that it is accompanied with a corresponding and genuine blessing from God. But to argue for its necessity from New Testament premises is to abuse language.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

THE GRACE OF CONFIRMATION

THE failure of theologians to agree about the relation of the grace of Confirmation to that of Baptism is well known. It is regrettable because it furnishes a standing embarrassment to those who try to think out carefully the instruction they give to confirmands. On the one hand we have the view ably propounded by Dr. Mason (*The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*), that although Baptism makes us members of Christ, it does not mediate to us the indwelling of the Spirit. The Spirit's action upon us, intimate as it is, is *ab extra* until Confirmation brings Him to dwell in us for the first time. On the other hand we have the commoner view expressed carefully by Dr. Darwell Stone (*Holy Baptism*), that in Baptism "the Christian receives the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost. . . . In Confirmation the Christian receives a fresh gift of the same divine indwelling" (*op. cit.*, p. 72); and set forth less cautiously by Dr. N. P. Williams in THEOLOGY, February, 1930. Dr. Williams writes that the Apostles, or the Church, distinguished between "two outpourings or instalments of the Holy Spirit" upon the baptized and the confirmed respectively, and that Confirmation "imparts the second and final instalment of the Holy Spirit." The uncertainty of the Church's teaching is reflected in her Book of Common Prayer. Both Dr. Mason and Dr. Stone appeal to the Prayer Book in support of their views. The truth is that in this matter—as in others—the Book of Common Prayer adopts ambiguous language so as to avoid definition. In this connection the addition to the Catechism in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1929 is interesting. This defines Confirmation as "an apostolic and sacramental rite by which the Holy Spirit is given to complete our Baptism, so that we may be strengthened in our Christian life." If this stood alone it would seem to commit

the Scottish Church to the teaching that the Holy Spirit is not "given" in Baptism. The Scottish Book, however, retains in the Baptismal Service the petition: "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant," etc., and in its revised Order of Confirmation it follows our 1928 Prayer Book in interpreting Acts viii. as teaching that "a special gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed through laying-on of hands with prayer." More clarity is desirable. To say that "the Holy Spirit is given" is not exactly the same as saying that "a special gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed," though the latter phrase can be squared with Dr. Mason's theory by supposing that the special gift of the Spirit referred to is precisely His indwelling as distinct from His external action upon us, while the former phrase can equally well bear the meaning which Dr. Stone would put upon it. Thus the distressing ambiguity has not been removed by the latest revisions of the Prayer Book.

It seems natural to turn for light on this subject to the accounts of our Lord's Baptism, and both Dr. Mason and Dr. Stone do so, but unfortunately arrive at opposite conclusions, although both maintain that in our Lord's Baptism we should find a parallel, not with our Baptism, but with our Confirmation, which is perhaps a little odd. Dr. Mason urges that at Christ's Baptism "a new relationship was then established between the human nature of our Lord and the personal Spirit of God. The Spirit descended and abode upon Him. A fulness of personal indwelling was typified even by the form in which He appeared. Unlike the distributed tongues which lighted and sat upon each of the Apostles, the dove-like form suggests the thought of a living integer, not to be broken up and bestowed in a partial manner" (*op. cit.*, p. 459). Without stopping to discuss the apparent assumption that at Pentecost the Apostles only received "portions" of the Spirit, we note that Mason's interpretation implies the view that until He was baptized our Lord did not enjoy the fulness of the Spirit's personal indwelling. The same view is professed by Dr. Swete (*The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*), and adopted from him by Dr. Lowther Clarke (*Confirmation*, Vol. I., p. 15). Swete says that at His Baptism "the Messiah was about to enter on His official life . . . and must receive a new outpouring of the Spirit" (*op. cit.*, pp. 45-46). Can we really tolerate the view that our Lord did not possess the Spirit in all the fulness of His indwelling power until He was thirty years old? This seems to us a desperately difficult position which should only be adopted under pressure of the most absolute necessity, and it cannot be shown that any such necessity exists. Dr. Stone avoids the difficulty, for he sees that our Lord as man received

the personal indwelling of the Spirit *at His conception*, and that what He received at His Baptism was "a fresh gift of the same divine indwelling" (*op. cit.*, p. 72). What Dr. Swete meant by "a new outpouring of the Spirit" was probably exactly what Dr. Stone means by "a fresh gift of the same divine indwelling," but Swete's expression is unacceptable because it seems to countenance the notion that our Lord was not always fully indwelt by the Spirit.

Dr. Stone's view, however, needs to be considered further. It is not clear why he should regard our Lord's Baptism as analogous to our Confirmation rather than to our Baptism. It is more natural to compare like things. If we do so, we find that we must ask why, if our Lord's Baptism cannot be regarded as the beginning of the Spirit's indwelling in Him, our own Baptism should be supposed to be the beginning of His indwelling in us. It is true that in His case Holy Scripture tells us that the Spirit was concerned in a special way with His conception, and that nothing like this is said about our conception. Nevertheless, if it is true of Christ—as we do not doubt—that all things were created in Him and through Him and unto Him, that in Him all things consist, and that He is the light which lightens every man, is there not a sense in which all men are members of Christ whether they are baptized or not? And if the life that is in men is sustained moment by moment by Christ, is not this done through His Spirit, who must therefore be said to indwell us all? We cannot accept Dr. Mason's view that all the relations of the Spirit with us prior to our Confirmation are external relations. Nothing can be in us more than our life is, and we owe our life to the cosmic functions of the Logos through the Spirit. It seems, then, that we must say that all men are indwelt by the Spirit from the first moment of their existence.

At first sight, however, this view seems quite irreconcilable with numerous passages in the New Testament. The Fourth Gospel says plainly that during our Lord's ministry "the Spirit was not yet" (vii. 39). It represents Jesus as speaking repeatedly of a future bestowal of the Spirit, and describes Him as making this bestowal after His Resurrection. Uniformly with this, the Acts and Epistles describe baptized Christians, but not all men, as possessors of the Spirit. How, then, can we say that all men possess the Spirit from the first moment of their existence?

To begin with, we note that certain O.T. passages speak of individuals who, although of course unbaptized, were indwelt by the Spirit (see, *e.g.*, Gen. xli. 38; Num. xi. 16-30). Our Lord cannot have spoken of the Spirit as a gift reserved only for the future without contradicting these O.T. passages, and we feel

sure that He did not do this, especially as in the Synoptic Gospels He recognizes the activity of the Holy Spirit in O.T. personages (Mark xii. 36), and seems to regard blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as a sin which men were already in danger of committing (Mark iii. 29), while He speaks elsewhere of the Spirit without explaining that it was necessary to wait for His future bestowal (Mark xiii. 11; *cf.* Luke xi. 13). Even the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as speaking of Spirit-baptism as if it were something already available (iii. 5-8). Dr. Mason himself allows that "there are recorded experiences of men to whom the Holy Spirit has been given in a remarkable degree outside the Catholic Church, as well as within, and in ways less sacramental than the Laying-on of Hands" (*op. cit.*, p. 453), and he cites Cardinal Manning to the effect that "it would not be true to say, Where the Church is not, neither is the Spirit there. The operations of the Holy Ghost have always pervaded the whole race of men from the beginning, and they are now in full activity even among those who are without the Church." We must recognize that in the New Testament possession of the Spirit by individuals was inferred from their conduct. This appears very plainly in Acts x. 44-46, but is discernible elsewhere (*e.g.*, Acts viii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 3). The tests used were not in all cases the tests we should use today, but if the fruit of the Spirit is correctly described in Gal. v. 22-23, it is quite impossible to hold that no unbaptized person ever proves his possession of the Spirit by producing the characteristic results of His indwelling. Further, as we have already seen, the N.T. can speak of a "coming" of the Spirit upon One from whom we cannot allow that He was ever for a moment absent.

Before we turn to the solution of our problem we may remark that the language of the Church in this connection is not readily intelligible. At Baptism we find the petition, "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant," etc., and at Confirmation the language used gives the impression that the Holy Spirit either already is, or now becomes, the abiding possession of the candidates. Indeed, as we have seen, Dr. N. P. Williams speaks of Confirmation as imparting "the second and final instalment of the Holy Spirit." Yet in the Ordinal the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," etc., are said over confirmed persons, while at Quinquagesima the Church bids us pray, "Send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity," and on the Sunday after Ascension Day to ask God to "send to us thine Holy Ghost to comfort us." Thus the Prayer Book as well as the New Testament can speak of a "coming" of the Spirit without meaning it to be inferred that the Spirit has hitherto been absent from the persons concerned. Incidentally

this kind of language is greatly extended if Dr. Williams' later view is right, that Grace should be equated with the Holy Spirit (see *The Grace of God*, pp. 110-112), for we are always praying for Grace.

Now one way of escape from the difficulty is to suppose that the Spirit may be given by measure. Thus Dr. Williams writes that "Baptism and Confirmation both confer the gift of the Holy Spirit, the former imparting His presence in that measure which is necessary for new birth and salvation, the latter bestowing a further influx in His life-giving power adequate, if rightly used and responded to, for the achievement of Christian perfection and stability" (THEOLOGY, February, 1930). This explanation of the relation of Confirmation to Baptism is the common one, but it offends against the principle—which seems axiomatic—that because the Spirit is Person, where He is, there He is entirely; and we have already seen that language of this kind, though apparently demanded by the Synoptic accounts, cannot really be applied to our Lord's Baptism. Further, the New Testament does *not* speak of a second instalment of the Holy Spirit as mediated through Confirmation. The only N.T. passages which explicitly connect the gift of the Spirit with Confirmation are Acts viii. 14-17 and xix. 1-6. The former plainly, and the latter by implication, *disconnect* the gift from Baptism. It is therefore not a second, but a first, outpouring of the Spirit which these passages annex to Confirmation, just as other N.T. passages seem to annex this first outpouring to Baptism without mention of Confirmation. We believe that in this second group of passages the baptismal washing is to be regarded as accompanied by the Laying-on of Hands, but whether this was so or not, there is no hint of a "second instalment of Holy Spirit."

There are, however, three passages which may seem to some to justify the idea that the Spirit may be given by instalments. In 2 Cor. i. 22 and v. 5, St. Paul speaks of "the earnest of the Spirit," and in Phil. i. 19 he expresses his confidence that his troubles will turn to his salvation through the prayer of the Philippians and through "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." As to the phrase in 2 Cor., Dr. Mozley (*New Commentary*) agrees with Dr. Plummer (*I.C.C.*) that "the thought is not of a promise of a future donation of the Spirit, but of the gift of the Spirit as 'the first instalment of eternal life'" (*cf.* Ephes. i. 13-14). Nor does the Philippian passage mean that late in his Christian career St. Paul hoped to receive a further supply of the Spirit. He is there merely expressing his faith that his equipment of the Spirit was sufficient to enable him to profit even from adverse circumstances. The over-

whelming tenor of N.T. teaching about the gift of the Spirit supports this view, for it is always assumed that Christians possess the Spirit, and there is no hint that other instalments of Holy Spirit might be given. Nor must we think of the Spirit as divided up into portions, of which we each possess one, for the Spirit, like Christ (1 Cor. i. 13), is indivisible. We are temples, not of portions of the Spirit, but of the whole Spirit of God. This of course does not mean that the Spirit is spatially contained within our bodies, but that the Spirit continuously and personally works in us. In our ordinary affairs, a gift usually becomes detached from the giver, and may then be enjoyed apart from him, but the gift of the Spirit is His personal relationship with us, and not only can this gift not be detached from the Giver, but also without it we ourselves would cease to exist. Language which implies that the Spirit may be less or more present, then, seems unsatisfactory. Can we find a solution of our problem elsewhere? We believe that we can do so.

There is, as Dr. Mason observes, "a two-fold indwelling [of the Spirit] spoken of in Holy Scripture, of which one is objective and the other subjective" (*op. cit.*, p. 448). It is this subjective indwelling which is in view in such passages as 1 Thess. v. 19; Ephes. iii. 16-17, v. 18; and 2 Tim. i. 6. As Mason says: "The objective donation of the Spirit to dwell in us is not necessarily followed, though it always ought to be followed, by the subjective movement which alone makes it possible for Him to accomplish the full purpose of His coming" (p. 450). This distinction of objective and subjective indwelling is most useful, but is there any justification either for Mason's view that "it is the objective, personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in us which is the virtue of the Laying-on of Hands" (*ibid.*), or for the more common view that this objective indwelling begins at Baptism? We have seen that Dr. Stone expressly repudiates this latter view in the case of our Lord's Baptism, though illogically he champions it in the case of ours. Dr. Mason, while urging that Christ's Baptism was the beginning of the Spirit's indwelling in Him (see p. 3), bases this view entirely on the Synoptic accounts, and apparently does not see the difficulty that to us seems intolerable—viz., that we cannot conceive how God the Son incarnate can ever for a moment have been without the fulness of the Spirit's indwelling. We entirely reject the notion that the Spirit began to dwell in our Lord at His Baptism. Believing that the Voice and the Vision at His Baptism were an inner experience of our Lord's, we hold that at least this part of the story of His Baptism comes from Jesus Himself; but even so, we do not think that the account of the

descent of the Spirit in dove-like form upon Him is anything more than a picturesque expression of His conviction, reached then with complete clearness for the first time, that He was the Messiah and was therefore equipped by the Spirit to fulfil that vocation. To realize one's equipment is not the same thing as to receive it, even though the practical results are much the same. Doubtless our Lord had already realized the Spirit's presence in Himself, but at His Baptism He realized this for a new purpose and in a higher degree. There was, not a beginning either of the objective or the subjective indwelling, but an extension of the subjective indwelling. If this should seem to depart too much from the Synoptic accounts of the Baptism, we urge that the exact phraseology of these may be influenced by the ideas of those who mediated to the Evangelists our Lord's own account of His experience, and that our view avoids the acute difficulty mentioned above which the Synoptic story taken alone seems to force upon us. And if there are some who shrink from the idea that even our Lord's subjective apprehension of the Spirit can have undergone extension, we would urge that this is what is meant in Luke ii. 40, 52, even though the word πνεύματι be rightly omitted in v. 40; and that the idea is really inseparable from the idea of an incarnation of God in a baby who grew up to manhood.

We can now see how it can be true that the Spirit indwells all men from the first moment of their existence, and yet that there is a distinctive Christian experience of the Spirit. This subjective indwelling of the Spirit obviously may take many forms and may be mediated in many ways, and we should not for a moment sin against truth and charity by denying that even the unbaptized often display it to a remarkable extent. That God is not bound by His sacraments, however, is not a sufficient justification for disuse of them. We may reasonably claim that the following of God's appointed way is more likely to produce the fruit of the Spirit in all its attractive fulness than any uncovenanted path.

Perhaps we may now make our position clearer by suggesting an amended version of a sentence already quoted from Dr. Williams: "Baptism and Confirmation both release the activity of the indwelling Spirit, the former allowing His presence to express itself in that form which is necessary for new birth and salvation, the latter allowing an expression of His life-giving power adequate, if rightly used and responded to, for the achievement of Christian perfection and stability." Similarly we may say that Penance, Unction, Matrimony, and Holy Orders release the activity of the indwelling Spirit for the purposes indicated in these sacraments. The same is true

of Holy Communion, but here there is a special parallel which we wish to emphasize. In Holy Communion we believe that the whole Christ offers Himself to us, "that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us," but obviously this cannot mean that at each Communion He comes to dwell in us for the first time. What is really thought of is a more effective subjective indwelling of the already objectively indwelling Christ. He as Logos is already so related to us that He dwells in us and we in Him, and if this ceased to be so we should cease to exist. But the vast majority of men are quite unaware of this relationship—to their own great loss, and Holy Communion is His own covenanted way of fostering our subjective awareness of it. Although we tend to think more of our Lord's activity than of the Spirit's activity in Holy Communion, we must remember that our Lord's activity is that of His Spirit.

We urge, then, that Baptism and Confirmation are occasions, or rather may be occasions, of the more effective subjective indwelling of the already objectively indwelling Spirit. We say "may be occasions" because in Infant Baptism and (in the Eastern Church) Infant Confirmation it is difficult to see how anything subjective can happen at the time of the administration of the sacraments. The Catholic Church has always held that a right disposition is necessary for the fruitful receiving of a sacrament, but has not regarded absence of a right disposition at the time of the receiving of a sacrament as invalidating that sacrament in such a sense as to require its repetition. No one has ever been rebaptized, reconfirmed, remarried,* or reordained on the ground that he had not a right disposition when he received the sacrament. Yet equally the Church has never taught that sacraments do their work of their own power in a way that makes the co-operation of the recipient unnecessary. We can now understand this better. A sacrament is not a means of bestowing the Spirit, or grace, upon us from without, but of evoking the activity of the Spirit, or grace, from within. If we oppose the barrier of opposition to, or of non-co-operation with, the Spirit's activity, we hold up the Spirit's action within us. It is not that a supply of the Spirit, or of grace, is then held for us elsewhere in a kind of suspense account until we deserve to have it paid into our own current account for us to draw upon. We may usefully think of sacraments as bringing us within certain environments. Baptism brings us within the environment of the Church's membership; Confirmation extends that environment to include the full privileges and responsibilities of that membership; Penance restores us to that environment after sin has driven

* We are not thinking, here, of absence of free consent as a diriment impediment.

us in greater or less degree from it; Holy Communion strengthens our subjective apprehension of our unity with that environment as embodied in our Lord and in our fellow-members; Holy Matrimony brings us within a special form of that environment; Holy Unction restores our healthy physical co-operation with that environment; while Holy Orders give us authority to act as priests within that environment. And each of these sacraments releases the activity of the indwelling Spirit along the appropriate channels if we respond to the stimulus and demands of the environment. If we do not so respond, we "grieve the Holy Spirit," but the sacramental act has brought us within the new environment, and when the response is made later on, we draw on the power that has always been at our disposal—*i.e.*, the power of the indwelling Spirit. We think that our Anglican formularies are patient of this interpretation. As regards the Order of Confirmation, there is no statement which compels us to say that in that sacrament the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in us for the first time. What is prayed for is that the candidate may daily increase "in" the Spirit—*i.e.*, may daily become subjectively more aware of the power of the Spirit who already indwells him. There is not an increase of the Spirit, who is wholly present already, but an increase of His subjective indwelling. Our Baptismal Service is not usually interpreted in this way, but a close study of it will reveal the fact that there is nothing to prevent its being interpreted thus. The only passage seemingly intractable is the petition, "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant," which, however, is qualified by an expression of the purpose for which the Spirit is sought: "that he may be born again," etc. We suggest that this petition can only imply that the Spirit is thought of as coming *ab extra* and for the first time if the similar petition, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," etc., in the Ordinal can bear this interpretation, which plainly it cannot do. We hold that the Baptismal petition means, "Grant that the objectively indwelling Spirit may be subjectively apprehended in the experiences of regeneration and salvation." We urge that N.T. language about the "coming" of the Spirit upon the initiated must be interpreted in the same way. We see this clearly as regards our Lord's Baptism, for we cannot think either of a beginning or of an extension of the Spirit's objective indwelling in Him then, and we find it difficult to conceive of these processes in ourselves. A subjective indwelling, however, admits of both beginning and extension, and we suggest that all the N.T. references to the bestowal of the Spirit should be understood of this subjective indwelling. The N.T. writers themselves may not consciously have made this distinction. They were, we think, too much

under the domination of that side of O.T. teaching about the Spirit which regarded His activity as spasmodic and confined to a few specially favoured individuals. But if they had been challenged, they would have agreed that the universal Fatherhood of God (Acts xvii. 25-29), and the cosmic functions of the Son, involved the activity of a universally immanent Spirit.

When, therefore, we compare a baptized person with an unbaptized person, we do not think of the former as possessing the Spirit while the latter does not, nor of the former as possessing more of the Spirit than the latter possesses. Rather we think of the baptized person as possessing the Spirit—or perhaps we should say, as possessed by the Spirit—*more effectively*. Similarly with Confirmation, always understanding that the recipient has made the right subjective response to the sacrament. The recipient's faith of course does not create the grace of the sacrament, but it is the necessary door through which the grace becomes effective in him.

We may be challenged to define our position as regards irregular rites practised by certain bodies of Christians—*e.g.*, the admission ceremonies which amongst Nonconformists take the place of Confirmation. Are they effective means of grace? Here we would quote a Roman Catholic writer. In *The Faith of the Roman Church* Father Martindale says that "if a man honestly thinks he is using a sacrament—if, for example, he asks for Communion from one who is no priest, but whom he thinks is—or if he really thinks there *are* no sacraments, but does what he can and would do more did he know how to, the mistaken worshipper will not go without his grace. Converts often fear that they will be asked to deny those gifts of grace they think, or 'feel,' they have received at the Holy Table. By no means. On the occasion of that honest and prayerful act, God gave them grace, more grace, doubtless, than the careless Catholic through his valid Communion" (p. 95). There is no need for an Anglican to be more rigid than a Roman. We do not mean that because a rite may be effective, though irregular, therefore the irregularity does not matter. As long as the irregularity continues, the environment of which we have spoken will not provide such an effective stimulus or make such irresistible demands as would an environment unbroken by irregularities.

The Grace of Confirmation, then, is the releasing of the activity of the indwelling Spirit in us through our admission to full membership in the Church. To experience it to its fullest extent we must make the completest possible response to the demands which this membership makes upon us, when we shall find that this grace is sufficient for us.

A. E. MORRIS.

THE FATHER'S GLORY*

Introductory

My purpose in these lectures is to seek to set before you some considerations on the Christian revelation of the Father. I use the term "considerations" advisedly; for the lectures will not have either the range or the coherence of a dogmatic treatise—not the range, because our study will be almost wholly confined to the teaching of the New Testament; and not the coherence, because there are many relations of the doctrine (such as its bearing on Christology and on the dogma of the Trinity) which I must perforce leave on one side. None the less, within its more modest limits I hope that this study may be useful. For the truth of God's Fatherhood has suffered in recent years in more ways than one. On the one hand, it has been so much taken for granted as to be half forgotten; just as the sheet-anchor of a ship may be out of mind because it is out of sight. Few would deny that the doctrine of God the Father is the sheet-anchor of faith; the security of our moral life and the possibility of prayer and worship alike depend upon it. Yet many other aspects of religion seem to crowd it out of mind. Such different movements of thought as the growth of belief in the sacraments and the critical study of the Gospels have conspired to make the Church life of our day increasingly Christo-centric; and from that it has been easy to slip into resting in Christ as the final term of devotion. But such a resting involves a curtailment of true discipleship. The whole of Christ's own teaching was directed towards leading the disciples, not to Himself, but through Himself to the Father; and, as Hort has pointed out, "the stronger the affirmation of His own divine nature, the clearer became His testimony to the Father who sent Him."† We cannot remind ourselves too often that the goal of the soul's journey is not the Son, but the Father. And this will entail a constant consideration of His nature and attributes.

But the truth of God's Fatherhood has suffered equally in other hands through an over-emphasis which has blurred its true proportions, and, by abstracting it from its historical setting, has distorted its true meaning. This school has fastened upon Christ's teaching about the Father as though it could be detached from the theism of the Old Testament and from the Christology of the Gospels and proclaimed as an independent revelation of which He was simply the prophet. The conception

* The first of the White Lectures, delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral on February 17th last.

† *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, p. 155.

is studied as one that belongs to the inner life and experience of Jesus, whose sense of filial dependence upon God was real and vivid to a unique degree; but, apart from that, the idea is not regarded as being controlled by the history. Yet that is in effect seriously to curtail the relevant evidence. At the one end, it ignores the background of the Old Dispensation against which Jesus and His teaching stand; at the other it takes no account of the form which the belief in God's Fatherhood took in the primitive Church. It lays, in short, so much emphasis on the Father of Jesus that we cannot see "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"—of Him, that is, who suffered and died and rose again to the Father's glory, and in whose room the Father has sent the Holy Ghost the Comforter. And yet it is in relation to this whole series of happenings that the revelation of the Father is given us in the New Testament.

There is justification, then, for a fresh attempt to appraise this element of the New Testament revelation. But the foregoing criticisms are an indication that the limits of the task are by no means easily determined. For the doctrine of the Father in the New Testament is a part, and indeed the most important part, of its theistic teaching as a whole; but it is not the whole, and some criterion is needed by which to distinguish what belongs properly to the revelation of the Father from what is of more general signification. In so far as attributes ascribed in the Old Testament to God are assigned in the New to one or other of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity (though not, indeed, in that developed terminology), the task is comparatively straightforward. But it is far more complex when we appear to find that to the Father are ascribed functions and attributes which Jewish religion associated with the Godhead in Itself. Are such revelations to be reckoned as strictly speaking part of the Christian revelation of the Father? Or are they to be regarded as traditional Jewish teaching, taken over by Jesus, about the God whom He had come, on other grounds, to know and to reveal as "the Father"? I must confess to being able to offer no *a priori* answer to the question; *solvitur ambulando*. Yet such a pragmatic solution is not without its defence. For it is one of the characteristics of Christ's teaching that old and new in it are so combined by the alchemy of His personality that they form together one new and original whole. The fundamental truths of Jewish theism, that is to say, which He takes over, are transformed as well as retained in the process of adoption. They are the same jewels; but they are set now in a new order in a new crown. And it is not merely rhetoric to say that that crown is His crown of thorns.

The practical method which I propose to adopt is as follows. I must begin by postulating theism—the theism both of Natural Theology and of Old Testament revelation. Such theistic belief underlies the whole teaching of the New Testament about God, and therefore about the Father; and to dispense with it is like trying to build a house on sand. With theism, therefore, as foundation, the subject will be considered under the headings of those five attributes of the Father which are mentioned in the Lord's Prayer—His glory, His name, His will, His power, and His kingdom. I will disown at once any attempt to make these lectures a study of the Lord's Prayer; the classification, in fact, suggested itself to me only after I had already collated a large part of the materials for this discussion. Yet the classification will not be without advantage, if it serves to bring home to us again that every advance in understanding of the Christian faith opens up new possibilities of prayer, and "every addition to truth becomes a fresh opportunity for adoration."*

Natural Theology and Revelation

I spoke just now of the necessity of postulating theism; something must now be said as to its two expressions in Natural Theology and in Revelation respectively. Natural Theology is a term properly used of teaching about God which is derived from observation of, and reflection upon, nature (φύσις) or the reality of things. It is thus a branch of philosophy or science. It is true, of course, that not all philosophers nor all scientists are led by their studies to belief in God at all; but when they are so led and become theists, their discussion of God's being and character—if they go so far as to say anything of His character—belongs to the sphere of Natural Theology. And there is a continuous tradition of such thinkers from Plato onwards. Plato's theology has been summed up by the greatest of his modern exponents, Professor A. E. Taylor, in the phrase *credo in unum Deum, vivum et remuneratorem—i.e.*, God's Being, His Providence, and His Judgment of men are three truths which it belongs to pure science to affirm of Him. Plato's great disciple, Aristotle, who found happiness to consist in the contemplation of God, was no less of a theologian than his master; and the same might be said of some of the Stoics. So, when St. Paul said that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead,"† he was but summing up an already current tradition of European thought and incorporating it in Christianity.

* *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, p. 85.

† Rom. i. 20.

And in Christianity, whether as part of it or in friendly contact with it, the tradition has had a great history. The Dean of St. Paul's has recalled us in recent years to the teaching of the Neo-Platonists; and it may be hoped that that fine and troubled soul, Boëthius, whose *Consolation of Philosophy* was once the *vade mecum* of the learned, will some day come likewise into his own. In the Middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas devotes one of his most important works, the *Summa contra Gentiles*, to a defence of theism on grounds of Natural Theology. In England the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century, and Dr. Samuel Clarke in the early eighteenth, revived the tradition in reply to Hobbes; while thirty years later it found its greatest exponent in Bishop Butler, the author of the *Analogy*. Many other names occur to us in the same connection since then —Maurice, Mansel, and Westcott, in particular; but Butler's *Analogy*, first published in 1736, still remains the great English classic on the subject, and is still eminently deserving of every hour of study that can be given to it.

Natural Theology, then, is concerned with that which can be understood of God by the natural reason alone: but how much is that? Its limitations were realized and expressed in a well-known passage of Plato. Simmias has been discussing the problem of immortality with Socrates, and he concludes thus:

> For in such matters, I think, Socrates, as I fancy you do too, that clear knowledge in this present life is either impossible or desperately difficult to come by; while yet, on the other hand, not to submit what is said about them to a thorough examination or to throw up the sponge before one is exhausted by the thoroughness of one's search argues a man of very poor mettle. Only two courses seem possible in regard to truth of this kind—either to learn or find it out, or else, if that is impossible, to take the best and most irrefragable of human arguments about it, and commit oneself to this as though it were a kind of raft, and so make life's voyage to the end—unless one were able to travel more safely and with less risk upon a securer craft, namely some word divine.*

"Some word divine"—there is Plato voicing the need of man for Revelation. Up to a point we can know God from His works and by the light of reason only; beyond that, we can know Him only in so far as He discloses Himself. It is the claim of the three great prophetic religions—Judaism, Christianity, Islam—that there has been such a word divine; nay, in the case of Christianity, that this word, which was spoken only in muffled accents by Moses and Mahommed, was in Christ "made flesh, and dwelt amongst us; and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father full of grace and truth."

* *Phædr.*, 85 *c*.

We shall perhaps best see what we mean by Revelation if we consider certain of the problems of its relation to Natural Theology. Let us take three.

1. First, where does Natural Theology end and Revelation begin? Granted that Natural Theology has limits, can we say more precisely at what point they come? The question is not an easy one, and the difference in the answers given covers a wide range. According to Sir James Jeans, for instance, whose Rede Lecture is a most striking essay in Natural Theology, the scientist as such cannot say more of God than that He is "a pure mathematician." At the same time, he insists that the universe thus mathematically constructed and studied is in motion—one might almost say in harmonic motion; so that Sir James Jeans can write that "the laws which nature obeys are less suggestive of those which a machine obeys in its motion than of those which a musician obeys in writing a fugue, or a poet in composing a sonnet." That looks as though not only thought, but also beauty, belonged to nature's God—though Sir James does, in fact, deny to Him æsthetic appreciation. But more than that we cannot say; the new mathematical physics, for instance, does not tell us anything of God's *character*; of what He purposes, desires, or condemns. This view we may call the minimal view of the range of Natural Theology. Quite another story is told, however, by Bishop Butler, who in the *Analogy* extends Natural Religion to include even such a characteristic Christian doctrine as that God is our Father. I cannot now go into his reasoning on the point, though, indeed, he does not reason much about it; he seems to regard the benevolence of the Creator* (which is what He means by the term "Father") as something which by general consent is impressed upon us by the facts of nature. The truth probably is that Butler found some common ground here with his deistical opponents, and did not wish to make controversy where it was not necessary. But, however that may be, it is clear that different thinkers have held different views on the question before us.

Some hazard is involved in suggesting an answer to the question, where such learned doctors disagree. And yet perhaps it is worth trying; and the standpoint from which I think we may hope to make most progress is the old Aristotelian one of the Four Causes. The Four Causes represent four points of view from which any individual object may be known; they correspond to four questions which must be asked about anything if we are to know it. They are: (1) the material cause, corresponding to the question, "What is it made of?" (2) the formal cause, answering to "What is it?" (3) the efficient cause,

* *Cf.* Philo, *de Monarchia*, i. 4, cited by Abrahams, *The Glory of God*, pp. 34, 35.

answering to "Who made it?" and (4) the final cause, answering to "What is it for?"*

Now, as I understand it, the mathematical philosophy of today succeeds very remarkably in describing the universe in terms of the first three causes, but is baffled as to the fourth. In answering the question "What is it made of?" Sir James Jeans and Dr. Eddington reach an ultimate analysis which resolves the universe into "waves of probability," or into a kind of thought-stuff. To the question "What is it?" they reply "It is an infinitely complex system of events and objects governed by mathematical laws." As efficient cause they speak quite definitely of a creative Mind, which is like the mind of a mathematician and a poet. But of final cause—though Dr. Eddington fills the gap from his own strong Christian mysticism—natural philosophy itself can say nothing. Statistically speaking—and that is how mathematics must speak—the existence of a planet like our own capable of producing and sustaining life is "an accident." Sir James Jeans can find no causal connection between the vast sidereal universe of matter, space, and radiation on the one hand, and on the other the sense of purpose and moral good which we on this planet entertain.

And it is just here that Revelation comes to the rescue. Wordsworth has put the truth in a nutshell in two lines of his great "Ode to Duty," when he says, addressing Duty:

> Thou dost preserve the Stars from wrong;
> And the most ancient Heavens, through Thee, are fresh and strong.

The highest dictates of our own consciences, that is to say, the noblest ends which our own moral reason can discern and pursue—these are revealed in religion as being implanted in us by the Creator of the world Himself and as representing, however fitfully and fragmentarily, the final end or good for which He has called the world into being. I need not remind you how deeply this truth is engraved upon the pages of Scripture. Take only the Psalms, which have ministered to the devotions of Jew and Christian alike for over twenty centuries, and consider how closely cosmology is interwoven with the most intense personal faith, and you have the clue to the point I am urging. Such a passage as:

> Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the foundations of his throne (Ps. xcvii. 2);

or

> The heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament showeth his handy-work.

* * * * * *

* Modern biology adds a fifth cause, "How has it come to be what it is?" But, even if it be admitted to rank with the other four, it can claim no priority over them and has not antiquated them.

> The law of the Lord is an undefiled law, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, and giveth wisdom unto the simple (Ps. xix. 1, 7),

represents very clearly the teleological character of Hebrew Theism. To the Jew have been revealed the ethical ends of the great Artificer of the universe.

2. This way of approach to the delimitation of the respective spheres of Natural Theology and of Revelation is found to throw light on the further question, that of the relation of the two to one another. The question is this: Is Revelation something simply added to Natural Theology, giving us supplementary knowledge in addition to that already given by the sciences, as you might say that you can add a knowledge of history to a knowledge of geography? Or does the knowledge which Revelation supplies not only supplement, but also modify, what we gain from those sciences? If what I have already urged is true, the second alternative must be adopted. As Sir Alexander Grant* points out, "the End or final cause . . . rises to an eminence beyond the other conceptions, and, though it must always stand opposed to matter, it tends to merge the other two causes into itself. The end of anything, that for the sake of which anything exists, can hardly be separated from the perfection of that thing, from its idea and form; thus the formal cause or definition becomes absorbed into the final cause. . . . In the same way the End mixes itself up with the efficient cause, the desire for the end gives the impulse of motion, the final cause of anything becomes identical with the good of that thing, so that the end and the good become synonymous terms. And this is not only the case with regard to individual objects, but all nature and the whole world exist for the sake of, and in dependence on, their final cause, which is the good. This, existing as an object of contemplation and desire, though itself immovable, moves all things." Some of you will recall in this connection the glorious closing cantos of Dante's *Paradiso*; others our own poet's

> Himself unmov'd, all Nature's source.

More simply, though more overwhelmingly, the truth is put in St. John's great words, "God is love."

The classical exposition in Scripture of what this means for the bearing of Revelation upon Natural Theology is to be found, I suppose, in the eighth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. There, even the material cause, no less than the final and the efficient causes, is swept up into the ambit of the final cause. His theme embraces "the whole creation" con-

* *The Ethics of Aristotle*, p. 221.

ceived as one interrelated system, closely knit of spirit and body, called into being by God and now travailing in hope and expectation, pregnant with His purpose. And what is that purpose? It is the manifestation of a new creation in Christ, peopled by those who, because they bear His likeness, can properly be called "the sons of God." The final cause of reality is conceived, that is to say, as consisting in what we may call "the inclusive Christ"—not Christ in His historical individuality only, but Christ fulfilled, completed, in His Body the Church, wherein the whole of ransomed and redeemed humanity is gathered. And you can see what light this conception throws back upon the other "causes" of the universe. The Creator is not only a great mathematician, but a great Lover: "the all-Wise is the all-Loving too." The universe is not only "an infinitely complex system of events and objects governed by mathematical laws," but, as our Lord Himself called it, "my Father's house," in which "are many mansions." Even for the world of body, though this is far beyond our power of imagination, there is something which is called "redemption."

3. Our third problem concerns the relation of Revelation to Natural Theology in respect of their method of knowledge. Are we not, we may suppose an objector saying, introducing Revelation as a kind of *deus ex machina* to help us to give the story a happy ending, after science has got it into a fix? Have we any right, when we have reached the confines of reason, suddenly to call for a new horse and ride off on that? How do we know that it is, from the standpoint of philosophy, a real horse at all and not a kind of rocking-horse, apt symbol of the fact that religion is a return to what the more high-brow sort of psychologists call "infantile modes of thought"?

The question is a searching one, and requires more than one line of reply. It would be important, for instance, to point out that science itself involves more faith than is commonly supposed. One of the main results, as I understand it, of Dr. Whitehead's work is to emphasize the symbolic and imaginal element in modern scientific knowledge, and to insist on the large element of faith involved in it. Again, it is important to insist, as Dr. Streeter has in *Reality*, that experience presents us with a world which contains not only things possessed of metrical properties and therefore amenable to treatment by the exact sciences, but also qualitative things whose value cannot be (in that sense) "measured," but are rather "appreciated"—things of beauty, for example, or of moral worth. But most important of all is it to realize that Revelation is not something apart from experience, but something given in and through experience. Religion, that is to say, is as genuine and real a

field of experience as any other—as the movements of the stars, for example, or the unfolding of the flowers. And it admits to a real knowledge, comparable in certain aspects to that reached by any branch of science. This is obviously so in regard to its historical side; the vast literature of research into the historical origins of Christianity is incomprehensible unless it were believed that the knowledge so to be acquired were both real and vitally important. Christianity imparts a new knowledge of God, not only because it interprets the old facts of life in a new way, but also because it introduces new facts, new *data*, into the discussion. It sets in the forefront of the relevant material the history of a nation and of individuals within it, and claims that they experienced life and interpreted it as they did, because God was disclosing to them, through all that happened, His own nature.*

I have spoken of the knowledge of God given by Revelation as comparable to the knowledge given by any science. Yet the differences are no less significant than the resemblances. As Hort says, "we rightly shrink from identifying such a knowledge (*sc.* of God) with other forms of knowledge to which we cannot refuse the same name."† This reluctance arises perhaps chiefly from the simplicity and directness of the knowledge mediated by Revelation, due to the fact that it consists primarily in the knowledge of One who is personal. It is therefore not an abstract, but a supremely concrete, kind of knowledge. The difference is well seen if we compare what Plato or Aristotle teaches with what the Bible teaches as to the possessors of the knowledge of God. Both the great Greek philosophers are fully alive to the ethical conditions of this knowledge. "Likeness to God," says Plato, "is to become just and holy and to have wisdom."‡ If we seek the blessedness of contemplating God, says Aristotle, "a man must as far as possible play the immortal, and do everything to live according to the highest that is in him."§ Yet neither Plato nor Aristotle would have found it possible to admit that a man without philosophical and scientific education could attain to the knowledge of God.‖ How different is the promise of the Jewish prophet: "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."¶ Here we are in another atmosphere; ethical and

* For a reasoned justification of this claim the reader is referred to the present writer's book, *The Approach to Christianity*, chapter iii.

† *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, p. 60.

‡ *Theaet.*, 176. *B.*

§ *Eth. Nicom.*, X. vii. 8.

‖ *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Plato, *Phædr.*, 248 D, E.

¶ Jer. xxxi. 34.

intellectual alike are taken up into a direct personal relationship between the soul and God; and this relationship is open to all. It is in this tradition of knowledge that we are to place our Lord's words: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."*

The Glory of God in the Old Testament

Natural Theology, then, points us to the reality of God, the Creator of all things, transcendent in wisdom and power. Revelation adds to this knowledge that of His character and purpose as the Source of all righteousness, mercy, and goodness, and, in so doing, enriches all that Reason can teach us of God as formal and efficient Cause. The resulting conception of God embodied in Hebraic and Jewish religion is one of unique depth, vigour, and clearness of outline. Among the many terms used in the Old Testament to express it none is more comprehensive than the word "glory."

The word "glory," both in Hebrew and in Greek, connotes primarily the manifested honour or eminence of a person or thing. It is thus well adapted to express the transcendent or numinous attributes of the Godhead. "The Divine Glory," says Dr. Abrahams, "tends, in all religious thought, to become a quality inherent in the essential nature of God."† Perhaps we should rather say "sum of qualities" than "quality"; for the Divine majesty and power on the one hand, and God's mercy and goodness on the other, are alike signified by it. To behold or to be brought near to God's glory in the Old Testament is to be overwhelmed with a sense of awe. Moses may only see part of God's glory (Exod. xxxiii. 23); when "the glory of the Lord" filled Solomon's temple at its dedication, the priests must needs take flight; Isaiah's vision of the divine glory issued in his "Woe is me! for I am undone." Yet, on the other side, this glory is full also of the fascination and comfort of God's grace. Thus, Moses' vision of the glory is accompanied by the divine message, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth"; Isaiah's shrinking is checked by the pardon brought by the seraph, and the call to the Lord's service. The glory of God represents, in short, the sum of His perfections.

And it represents these in manifestation. This does not mean that it signifies only those attributes of God which are revealed;

* John xvii. 3.

† *The Glory of God*, p. 29. I am much indebted throughout this section to this beautiful, if somewhat confused, book.

the awe and wonder aroused by the glory are the expression of man's consciousness that what is unrevealed is even greater than what is revealed. But the dominant idea in the Old Testament is of the glory as visibly manifested. In its earliest phases God's glory is shown in cloud, or thunder, or storm, or light;* though even so it is a moral and spiritual glory, and, if its most prominent feature is power, it is power directed to righteousness.† Further, while the glory is manifested most signally in particular theophanies, it permeates the whole universe; "the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. vi. 3). Sin alone bars the way to its complete manifestation and to man's complete vision of it. The glory of God is thus one of the terms which becomes closely associated with the Messianic hope, for the fulfilment of that hope involves the banishment of sin. All nations were then to share in the vision of the glory; and the prophets look forward to the time when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."‡

We are already on the edge of a further thought; the glory is not only manifested, but also in a sense imparted. This is expressly so of another term often used by Jewish writers, though not found in the Old Testament, which is almost synonymous with "glory"—namely, the "Shekinah" or "presence" of God.§ The symbol of this imparted glory or presence was the lamp that burnt continually in the Tabernacle and the Temple. And indeed how glorious Israel is! We do well to recognize the glory of literary and artistic creation which shone out of ancient Greece. There was a glory also, which our own nation has partly inherited, in the respect for the majesty of law of which the Roman Empire was the embodiment. But neither of these glories shines with a lustre like that of the glory of Israel. For Israel's glory is the highest of all glories, deriving from the revelation, peculiar to them, of God as Holy, and of human life as finding its highest end in consecration to His service. Through every vicissitude of the nation's story, and despite many and grave back-slidings, that light shines out on the world. Sometimes, it is true, it flashes only fitfully. There were times when there was "no open vision";‖ and even Ezekiel, the prophet of the divine Presence, saw the glory of God leaving the city.¶ But, even when its effulgence was most

* *Cf.* Ezek. i. 28; the association of God's glory with light is characteristic of this prophet.

† *Cf.* Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 24. ‡ Hab. ii. 14; *cf.* Isa. xi. 9, xl. 5.

§ C. W. Emmet (*H.D.B.* art. "Shekinah") says that "the S. was not 'the glory,' as is usually imagined, but the source and centre of it." But the terms are closely parallel, especially when the thought of the impartation to man is concerned.

‖ 1 Sam. iii. 1. ¶ Ezek. xi. 23; *cf.* xliii. 2.

screened and partial,* we see it shining out in the form of imperishable hope. For the full imparting, even more than the full manifestation, of God's glory is something which must await the Messianic age. Only then, when His Kingdom comes, will God dwell with men in the fulness of His glorious Presence.

The Father's Glory

It is of the essence of the Gospel proclaimed in the New Testament that this age has come, and that God's glory is uniquely revealed and communicated to men in the Person of Jesus Christ. The glory is now seated in a perfect human life; "we see the glory of a Father shown in an only Son."† The Incarnation, together with the Resurrection and Ascension and the dispensation of the Spirit which belong to it, is the unveiling of the divine glory as above all things the glory of the Father.

It is well that we should dwell on both terms of the phrase. The thought of the glory will remind us that nothing of the Otherness, Majesty, Almightiness of God, nothing of His cosmic powers, is abated, because we learn from Christ to call Him Father; just as the word "Father" expresses the truth that the Author and Final Cause of all that exists is yet in personal relation, through His own creative and redeeming action, with all His creatures.

That the Father is none other than God in all the fulness of His sovereignty is shown in our Lord's own words of thanksgiving, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth."‡ All nature is in His hands: He makes the sun to rise and the rain to fall.§ He is the Creator of the heavenly bodies and the Source of their light, Himself unchanged amidst their change.‖ It is He who originates the life of the human soul, both in its first and in its second birth, and He who decrees its final destiny."¶ At once transcendent and immanent, He pervades the universe, its efficient and its final Cause;** and He is the Source of all the generations of human and heavenly beings,†† so that, as Athanasius says, men are called "fathers" of their own children because God is supremely and alone truly father of His own Son.‡‡ Sin alone—the selfishness of the world—lies outside the sphere of the Father's creativity;§§ there is no pantheism in the New Testament conception. St. Paul sums up the doctrine in the phrase, "For to us there is but one God, the

* It was commonly taught by the Rabbis that God's glory was one of the six things which Adam and his descendants had lost through the Fall.

† Westcott, *The Revelation of the Father*, p. 169.

‡ Matt. xi. 25. § Matt. v. 45. ‖ James i. 17.

¶ James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23; Luke xii. 5. ** Eph. iv. 6.

†† Eph. ii. 13. ‡‡ *Orat. contra Arian.*, i. 23. §§ 1 John ii. 16.

Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him."* He does not say "of whom are all things, and all things unto him," but "and we unto him." The response of the creation is not coterminous with the Creator's energy and love; but for the believer in the one Lord Jesus Christ the Father is the end and goal of his life's journey. For to the Father pertains the life eternal, and in Christ that life has been manifested.†

Glory is an essential attribute of the Father;‡ and its full effulgence is seen in the only-begotten Son,§ whose whole life shines with it, revealing both its majesty and its mercy. But it is specially concentrated in certain particular events. Thus, the atmosphere of His birth was charged with heavenly glory.‖ At the Transfiguration the light with which He shone, and the voice which He heard, came from "the excellent glory" of the Father.¶ The raising of Lazarus was likewise a manifestation of His glory in response to the prayer of Jesus,** as were other of Christ's mighty works.†† But its supreme manifestation lay in the Cross and its wonderful sequel. In that crisis which followed the raising of Lazarus, and which seems in the Johannine narrative to take the place of the Agony in the Garden,‡‡ and again at that decisive moment when Judas having received the sop went out,§§ there was a glorifying both of God and of the Son of Man; for the sacrifice of Christ's surrender was already sealed, and it is in such sacrifice that God's glory is revealed. And it is to be followed by a still clearer manifestation. Christ dying on the Cross was glorified as Son of Man, representing Man in his highest act of obedience; when He is vindicated, He is to be glorified after another fashion—*i.e.*, in Himself, as Son—in the Resurrection and the Ascension and the triumph of His work. So St. Peter says that "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus";‖‖ and St. Paul says that it was "through the Father's glory" that Christ was raised from the dead.¶¶ In the Ascension, again, He was "crowned with glory and honour,"*** receiving again the glory that He had with the Father before the world was created.††† And it is the Father's glory which is manifested in the bestowal of eternal life upon all who believe in His Son.‡‡‡ Well may the Christian faith be called "the gospel of the glory of the blessed God."§§§

For this glory of the Father is imparted through Christ to

* 1 Cor. viii. 6. † 1 John i. 2. ‡ Eph. i. 17.
§ Heb. i. 3; John i. 14; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4. ‖ Luke ii. 9, 14, 32.
¶ Mark ix. 2 *ff.*; 2 Pet. i. 17. The Baptism is also in the mind of the author of 2 Pet.
** John xi. 40-42. †† *Cf.* St. Luke's constant use of δοξάζειν in this connection.
‡‡ John xii. 23-30. §§ John xiii. 31, 32.
‖‖ Acts iii. 13; *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 21. ¶¶ Rom. vi. 4. *** Heb. ii. 7, 9.
††† John xvii. 5. ‡‡‡ John xvii. 1-3. §§§ 1 Tim. i. 11.

believers; the Church also is glorious. The New Testament writers express the thought in various ways. Sometimes it is by comparison with the inferior glory of Israel. Jesus has more glory than Moses, as the son has more than the servant; and His house has therefore more glory than Moses'.* The glory resting on Moses giving the Law to the people was such that they could not bear its brightness, and he had to wear a veil: but it was evanescent. In the Christian Church, on the contrary, to which the veiled meaning of the Old Testament has become clear, believers have the direct vision of the divine glory, and, reflecting it as in a mirror, are changed increasingly into its likeness.† In other passages the glory imparted to the Church is connected with the sonship of believers, who enjoy a liberty unknown before either by Jew or Gentile.‡ Christ's work consists in "bringing many sons unto glory."§

The signs of God's glorious presence in the Church are manifold. It is as evident in the sufferings of Christians for their faith as it was in the Shekinah resting upon the ark.‖ God's free forgiveness poured upon those whom He has redeemed, and His extension of it to Gentile as well as Jew, are a revelation of His glory;¶ and it is reflected in their ethical conformity to the pattern of Christ;** and in the knowledge which they now have of God through Him;†† in the care bestowed on their various ministries;‡‡ and in the quality of their fellowship and mutual charity.§§

And, indeed, man's chief end, as it was that of the Lord on earth, is to set forth the Father's glory. He who sought the glory of Him who sent Him‖‖ laid it also on His disciples that they should by their example glorify their Father which is in heaven.¶¶ The sincerity and innocence of the Christian's conduct,*** the Church's faith in Christ††† and her prayer in His Name,‡‡‡ the fruitfulness which is the mark of true discipleship,§§§ all these alike have as their aim and motive the Father's glory. It is a commonplace that men do in fact judge of God and of His claims upon them by the behaviour of those who believe in Him. Their judgments may often be superficial and rest on inadequate evidence; but the criticism is one that Christ Himself and His Apostles in principle endorsed. We are called to show forth God's glory; for we are the disciples of One in whom its fulness dwells.

* Heb. iii. 1-6.

† 2 Cor. iii. 6-18. Dr. Goudge's exegesis of this chapter in his *Westminster Commentary* seems to me specially luminous and helpful.

‡ Rom viii. 21; *cf.* Eph. i. 5, 6. § Heb. ii. 10.

‖ 1 Pet. iv. 14. ¶ Rom. ix. 23; Col. i. 27. ** Rom. viii. 30.

†† 2 Cor. iv. 6. ‡‡ 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. §§ Rom. xv. 5-7.

‖‖ John vii. 18; *cf.* viii. 50-54. ¶¶ Matt. v. 16. *** Phil. i. 11.

††† Phil. ii. 11. ‡‡‡ John xiv. 13. §§§ John xv. 8.

The divine glory abides in the Church with a permanence and a closeness of relationship not found in Israel; for it is the body of Christ, the Messiah. But its manifestation is still incomplete, and partially frustrated by man's sin and by the weakness and corruption inherent in his earthly estate. Yet this will not always be so. Just as the Lord's humiliation was the prelude to His glorification, so the disciple too, now for a time afflicted, looks forward to "a far more exceeding weight of glory."* Jesus Himself had spoken of a time when the Son of Man would come "in the glory of His Father with the holy angels";† and though the predictions of the *Parousia* were partly fulfilled in the Resurrection and Pentecost,‡ the Church has learnt from the New Testament to cherish still a larger hope. We are bidden to entertain the expectation of a final manifestation of the Father's glory and of Christ's,§ in which the purposes of the whole creation, now so crossed and so obscure, will find their accomplishment in the emancipation of mankind and the full enfranchisement of sonship to God.‖ That consummation it is beyond our power to know or to imagine; only we know that we shall see God as He is, and seeing Him shall be made like Him.¶ And that conformity will represent the final showing of the Father's glory.

E. G. SELWYN.

COMMUNITY WORSHIP AND SOCIAL REFORM

IT is surely tragic to see churches half empty even on Sundays, when community worship diligently practised every day in the week would do so much to heal the ills not only of individuals but of society. To put the Book of Common Prayer or of Community Worship—for that is what the title means—into full and regular practice is the last thing that the harassed social reformer would think of nowadays. But if only it could be fairly tried, amazing results might be achieved.

For Common Prayer, diligently and devoutly used, is an incomparable school of sonship towards God, brotherly love among men, and all the natural and supernatural virtues; a divinely inspired and ordered school of Christian character. Character, the Christian character, is the foundation of true culture and civilization, and of all sound schemes of reform and social progress; and Christ Himself warned us that the house or social fabric that is not built upon that rock was bound

* 2 Cor. iv. 17. † Mark viii. 38.
‡ *Cf.* the present author's *The Teaching of Christ.*
§ Tit. ii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 13. ‖ Rom. viii. 18 *ff.* ¶ 1 John iii. 2.

to collapse when the storm assailed it. This is as true of "economic blizzards" as of other storms. Not only is worship a school of character such as will bear the strains involved in the growth of society; the family of God gathered together in His House, to hallow His Name, and to offer itself to Him to work for His kingdom in dependence upon His grace, is itself the kingdom of God in course of production and in training. It reflects His Fatherhood, and reveals His purposes; it is the glory of God made manifest. Centres of such life and co-operation with God let God into the world, and allow Him to show what He can do for us. They are radiating stations for His Spirit in the world: they are leaven in the lump of human life.

The fact that the influence or inflowing of God into a group of daily worshippers is indescribably gradual and gentle, like their influence in turn upon their neighbours, is not a weakness but a strength. One of the best parables of the life-giving grace of God is the rising of the sap in the grass, corn, and leafage in the spring. The most hidden, silent and gradual of all natural processes, it is also the most fruitful in life and beauty. The whole face of nature is transformed by it. All life, vegetable, animal and human, depends upon it. Another thing can be said of liturgical worship in proportion to the sincerity with which it is offered. Groups of devout and well-trained worshippers are powerful intercessors for the world: and unless we are to disbelieve the promises of Christ, it is prayer in His Name and in the fellowship of His Church, which is the principal means of getting things done for Him. It is the pleading of the Cross which really counts.

I

Now the Book of Common Prayer provides an order of community worship and intercession for every morning and evening in the week. Morning and Evening Prayer are to be said by the clergy daily; and the people are to be encouraged and invited to come. On Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays the Litany is to follow Mattins; and on Sundays and Holy Days the Holy Communion is to follow the Litany. Even a daily celebration is contemplated, where it is possible, at any rate at festival seasons.*

If people would take this scheme of worship seriously, they would find it a great school of the knowledge and love of God, of brotherly co-operation and fellowship, of humility and obedience, of peace, thankfulness and joy, and of all the other elements of Christian character and human happiness.

We shall, of course, be told that to spend so much time in

* See the rubric after the gospel for the Circumcision, and the rubric governing the proper prefaces.

church every day is impossible, and not very desirable if it were possible.

But we take for granted that it is worth while to spend about an hour and a half a day or more over our meals. And valuable as the social fruits of common meals are, to say nothing of our bodily requirements, are not the spiritual fruits of common prayer enumerated above worth a sacrifice of time and strength and attention? And as to possibility, things become progressively more practicable when an increasing number of people persevere in doing them. Social and domestic arrangements, even industrial demands, reluctantly but surely readjust themselves, and testify to the truth of the proverb that where there is a will there is a way.

And it is not as if everyone was really as busy as they think they are. When we really believe in things and want to do them, we make time for them with remarkable ingenuity.

II

And what about the unemployed?

Certainly the idea of the unemployed crowding our parish churches for daily Mattins and Evensong staggers the imagination. But that settles nothing. If the Imagination is staggered, let it sit down and listen to the voice of Reason.

We may concede that the difficulties are mountainous; but even so they are difficulties of prejudice and habit, not reasons why it could not or should not be done. If difficulties of contrary custom, misunderstanding, ignorance, social and spiritual self-consciousness and shyness, and other kinds of disinclination could be overcome, the solid advantages and possibilities of the thing might well move us to attempt it, at least in some places, and to succeed.

If the knowledge and love of God, if training in sonship to God and in brotherly fellowship with His children, and in the other virtues of the Christian life and character, are the supreme blessings of life; and if community worship on sound liturgical lines, with all its strength and all its variety and interest, is the best school of these things, then surely there can be no unanswerable reason why the unemployed should not learn the gentle art, and rejoice in it. It does not take great intellectual ability or learning to profit by the services of the Church, provided there is faith to believe in them and respect them, and willingness to learn a little at a time. Very simple people do it quite sufficiently well. The Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of sonship and brotherhood, the Spirit of simplicity and docility, would, if only we would give Him the opportunity, soon fill multi-

tudes of simple-hearted men with the enthusiasm of a supreme discovery, and with a desire to help one another to share it.

And the results? A revival and growth of pure and disciplined religion of incalculable value and extent.

To help these broken-hearted men to find their true dignity as sons of God in their Father's house, and to find themselves at home in the family of God as brothers on equal terms with all the children of God in heaven and on earth: to help them to realize the hope of the Kingdom of Heaven which is the birthright of all God's children, and to learn to turn their troubles to spiritual account through the Cross of Christ: what better help than this could we give them?

But all these gifts are to be had by those who humbly put themselves to school with the daily liturgical worship of the Church, especially if they have time to have it explained to them.

III

Leaders are what we need: leaders who believe in it themselves and understand it; and who have the God-given power of winning the attention, confidence, and docile co-operation of their followers. And there is hardly any limit to what the working man will believe and do, under the guidance of those who have this gift. Not only for the training of such leaders, but for the training of leaders for all sections of society, I long and pray for colleges of worship, at which young people, who have left school but have not yet found their vocation, and at which older people also, who have leisure when their day's work is done, could learn the principles and practice of liturgical worship thoroughly in a spiritual atmosphere and in fellowship. Young graduates who mean to be ordained, rightly think it worth while to spend a year or more at a theological college, the better to prepare for ordination. If any of them think, when they first go to such a college, that they go simply to prepare for an examination and a profession, they find out by experience that this is not the best of it. Many a man goes for this and stays to find God and his own soul there. The college is a place of spiritual vision and inspiration. It is a team of penitents who gain a vision of God there and a vision of their own vocation. They come to realize theology as the science of the knowledge and love of God and of their neighbours, and to desire discipline as the corollary of discipleship, the foundation of salvation and of success.

But the young laymen and laywomen of our day need this as really as the clergy, if not so eminently. To live a consistent Christian life in the educated lay world today, they need the intellectual foundation. And, after all, they are all called to

a life of liturgical worship at least on Sundays to the end of their lives, even if not to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. And if this is as great and responsible a vocation as we claim that it is, it is worth while preparing for expensively.

That young people who have just left school or college, and others, should spend a year at such a college, or live at a house of worship, will be regarded by most people as an extravagant idea, as wild as that of daily liturgical worship for the unemployed. But the sense of absurdity, if felt, is probably no more than a sense of violent contrast with the habits and mentality of our generation.

If liturgical worship is the noblest exercise of the powers of our nature; if, provided that it is intelligent and sincere, it is the best of all schools of Christian character, then sanctified common sense should assure us that to provide a thorough training for it, at least for an *élite* among the laity, would be a more reasonable policy than our present one. When young people of brains and ability are specializing in everything else, why should not the greatest of all human vocations be studied and taught with proportionate care?

There was, indeed, a time when theological colleges for ordinands were regarded as unnecessary and even undesirable. But they have come to stay.

Again, some of us can remember the thrill with which we first read the late Father Plater's article in the *Hibbert Journal* —I think it was in the autumn of 1908—about the Houses of Retreat for the laity, which were doing a great work for working men in Belgium. It is true that we have not yet got the working men of England to go into retreat in any large numbers; but since the war Houses of Retreat for the laity have been established in about half the dioceses of England, and are quietly doing a very good work.

It seems possible that a good deal might be done, by those who have won the confidence of the unemployed and others, by gathering them together in parish churches for quiet days, and using the opportunity to explain the theory of regular community worship on liturgical lines to them. A policy of little by little might be blessed by God with much fruit. Meanwhile I plead for a whole-hearted effort to put the Prayer Book scheme of daily services* into practice. If the devout laity would believe in it and support it personally, instead of breaking the hearts of the clergy who try to do so, a powerful nucleus of perpetual worship and intercession for the Church, the country, and the world, would be found in every parish. I am convinced that if the services of the Church were believed in,

* See the second section of the chapter "Concerning the Service of the Church," at the beginning of the Prayer Book.

taken seriously, and used as an organ of community prayer; if they were studied and trusted, instead of despised and neglected as not really worth the time that they require; if they were diligently used in dependence upon the Holy Spirit and in obedience to Mother Church who has provided them, they would justify themselves as more satisfying and fruitful than more apparently popular kinds of worship. They have great practical advantages over more emotional kinds of worship, more stability, more variety, more dignity, more depth, and in the long run more homeliness as well. We come back to them, as we come back to the best art in all directions, with a sense of finality and repose.

But it is an art which needs to be cultivated. "I went to one of your services last Sunday, to have a look at it; but I couldn't understand a word of it for the first half-hour: I reckon it was a waste of God's good time." So said an enquirer at an out-of-door meeting in the I.C.F. crusade in Brighton in October. I do not know what church he went to. But there is nothing to be gained by pandering to the idea that the worship of God is a slap-dash thing which can be judged offhand by the man in the street, and condemned if he does not feel attracted by it. On the other hand, if a man like that were to see groups of ordinary citizens or unemployed men and women laboriously learning the art of liturgical worship of the most solid sort, and inspired by the conviction that they had found a treasure for which they were gladly paying a real price, he might then be willing to be taught something himself: and to the teachable all things are possible.

The knowledge and love of God, the right way to approach Him and respond to His call, sonship towards God, brotherhood among men as the children of God, the art of sharing or communion, loyalty to Mother Church, the spirit of patience and forbearance, the spirit of docility, humility and penitence: all these things are the fruit of regular worship, if it be offered in the power of the Holy Ghost and in accordance with the Christian Revelation. And if they are learned there, all other life becomes a school of them. There is no guarantee that it will be so by itself.

That in a world like ours circumstances make it impossible for many of us to put ourselves to school in this way is obvious. But if all who could come, would come, and make worship the first charge upon their time, circumstances would gradually yield to pressure; and what is impossible at present would become possible in time. The crooked paths of life would be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord would be revealed, and all flesh would see it together.

F. M. DOWNTON.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We cannot normally notice pamphlets in Theology; but *The Threshold of Marriage*, published by the White Cross League (36, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W. 1, price 6d. net), is so good and so opportune that we must make an exception. The little book is the League's response to "the need of some further preparation for those members of the Church about to marry," which was emphasized by the Lambeth Conference. It seems to us well-nigh perfectly adapted for its purpose. Many a parish priest has wondered where to turn for the right thing to put in the hands of the young couple about to marry. Most of the available literature was too pietistic or too romantic or else so obsessed with the physical side of marriage as to blur the spiritual. Here we have at last what has been wanted—directness and reticence combined, the spiritual side kept uppermost without subterfuge, the bodily side explained without effrontery. We regard the book, small as it is, as a God-send.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Harvard Theological Review. January, 1932.

M. Goguel writes an acute but unnecessarily sceptical article on "Did Peter deny his Lord?" Without summarizing, or trying to answer, his argument, it is worth while to mention his treatment of John xxi. Recent commentators have been inclined to interpret the miraculous draught of fishes in Luke v. as a Resurrection appearance, transferred typically by the Evangelist to the beginning of the Ministry. Goguel gives convincing reasons for reversing the process. The clue is John xxi. 14: "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples, after he was risen from the dead." But ch. xx. has recorded three appearances to Mary Magdalene, the Apostles without Thomas, the Apostles with Thomas. To exclude Mary from the series because she is a woman is forced. But the verse comes naturally in another sequence.

(*a*) ii. 1. "This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and *manifested* his glory; and his *disciples* believed on him" (the typical epiphany put at the head of the Gospel).

(*b*) The Capernaum miracle, corresponding to the Capernaum miracles referred to in Luke iv. "This is again the second sign that Jesus did, having come out of Judæa into Galilee" (John iv. 54).

(*c*) "This is now the third time that Jesus was *manifested* to his *disciples*" (John xxi. 14, corresponding to Luke v. 1-11). John, that is to say, betrays the Galilæan ministry origin of the story and its sequence in his source, but puts it into a Resurrection setting by adding the words "after that he was risen from the dead."

M. Goguel makes another point of some importance to preachers. John xxi. 15-17 cannot be taken as in any sense a "rehabilitation" of St. Peter, seeing that already in xx. 21-23 Peter has received the plenitude of the Holy Spirit and the Apostolic Mission. W. K. L. C.

British Museum Quarterly. Vol. vi., Nos. 2 and 3.

These numbers contain among other items of interest illustrated articles on the following: (1) An unusually fine Sumerian statue probably of Judea

(*c.* 2600 B.C.). (2) Three engraved gems, one a fourth-century scarabæoid of elongated oval form, portraying Apollo riding on a swan; another a green jasper, possibly third century, in the form of a flat oval, with the subject of a negro, carrying, suspended on a pole, a pig and a branch of a fruit tree, most vividly represented. (3) A small collection of bronzes from Luristan in Western Persia; no definite information is yet to hand concerning the people or the age which produced them.

There is also an illustrated note on a recent acquisition of first-rate importance—a thirteenth-century Apocalypse, written and painted, it is thought, at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. The MS. is unfinished, with its pictures in various stages of completion, thus illustrating in an actual example the methods of mediæval illuminators.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxii., No. 3.

Dr. I. Sonne contributes an interesting article *Da Costa Studies*, in which he suggests that the book *Ḳol Sakhal*, generally attributed to Modena, is the work of da Costa himself, with additions, perhaps, by Modena. Da Costa, a convert in early manhood from Catholicism, was twice excommunicated from the synagogue, and died, with shattered faith and by his own hand, in 1647. If Dr. Sonne's view can be maintained we have in the *Ḳol Sakhal* Da Costa's apologia.

Dr. A. Marmonstein, writing on *Philo and the Names of God*, develops still further his theory already propounded by him in *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, that the usual Rabbinic interpretation according to which *Elohim* describes God in His capacity as Judge and the Tetragrammaton as the God of mercy and love, is of late origin. His paper is interesting and suggestive, but hardly convincing.

Dr. Joseph Reider, commenting on recent Biblical Literature, finds high praise for the *New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, edited by the late Dr. Charles Gore. Dr. H. G. Enelow, reviewing Mr. Montefiore's *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, seems less generous in his attitude towards Christianity than the distinguished writer of the book he reviews.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The January number opens with Father Dondeyne's learned article on the procedure employed in ballots in the Church before the time of Charlemagne. He specially applies it to the rite of baptism, and his results deserve attention. Father Nelis examines the collation to benefices in Belgium under Clement VII. (1378–1394). He thinks that the obedience then rendered to the Church in Belgium was hostile or, to say the least, inadequately enforced. Father de Poorter deals with a curious catechism of the thirteenth century. Father De le Court writes a note on Robert Bellarmine at Louvain, and everything that throws light on one of the most influential men of the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century is valuable. The reviews and the list of articles in foreign quarterlies attain the high standard we have long expected in this fine quarterly.

R. H. MURRAY.

REVIEWS

THE GROUND OF FAITH AND THE CHAOS OF THOUGHT. By Oliver Chase Quick, Canon of St. Paul's, London. Nisbet and Co., Ltd. 1931. 5s.

Canon Quick begins by asking us to think about the distinction between *causes of* and *reasons for* beliefs. The former are incidents in the psychological history of the believer, the latter are logical grounds independent of his personal progress through time-space. Then comes a survey of the present state of the world of thought, where a combination of freedom of inquiry with specialization is pictured as having produced a chaos such that reasons for belief are hard to discern, while causes of disbelief are many and powerful. Faced by this situation, many Christian apologists are tempted to pit causes of belief against causes of unbelief, and to abandon the search for reasons. Those who pin their faith in the infallibility of Councils, Pope, or Bible, and those who "speak as though they took it for granted that any religious belief or practice which draws people to Church or Sacrament, or stimulates the expression of devotional feeling, has by that very fact proved its truth or value," are included with the Barthians in a common condemnation—they attempt to cure doubt by seeking for certainty rather than for truth.

Not that Canon Quick is blind to the importance of the historical order of causation. He is fully aware that the reasoned faith of our search is not the contemplation of a logically coherent transcendental order as the sole reality. Our Creed must be the interpretation of this actual world of history, which must not be dissolved away in our attempt to see it as reasonably grounded. The mathematical physicist's God who is the cosmological principle implied in his science; the idealist philosopher's God who is the source and ground of all values; and the empiricist's God whose impact in history on individuals and nations evokes the response of religious devotion—these three are not mutually exclusive gods between whom we have to choose. The one true God must somehow or other be one in whom all three are harmoniously reconciled. How this can be is the fundamental problem for theology, and it is significant that in Christian thought two apparently contradictory arguments for Christian theism are both indispensable. We are asked to believe in the God of Christianity *both* because the Christian conception of God fits in so well with all else that we know of the universe, *and* because it is so extraordinary that no one would ever have thought of it had not God actually revealed

it of Himself! This paradox is not the weakness of Christianity; it is its strength. For it shows Christianity to be a religion which in its doctrine of God enshrines "the central difficulty of every spiritual metaphysic"—that is, "How can the cause of what is be one with the ground of what ought to be?"

In his concluding chapter, Canon Quick rightly points out that the adequacy of Christianity to meet the challenge of this mysterious and paradoxical universe is grounded in its acceptance of the historical figure, Jesus Christ, as God incarnate. This actually issues in the worship of One in whom particularity and universality are reconciled. One is irresistibly reminded of A. N. Whitehead's acutely penetrating contrast of Christianity with Buddhism in his *Religion in the Making*: "Christianity . . . has always been a religion seeking a metaphysic, in contrast to Buddhism, which is a metaphysic generating a religion." "Christianity . . . starts with a tremendous notion about the world. But this notion is not derived from a metaphysical doctrine, but from our comprehension of the sayings and actions of certain supreme lives. It is the genius of the religion to point at the facts and ask for their systematic interpretation." "Buddhism starts with the elucidatory dogmas; Christianity starts with the elucidatory facts." One is also reminded of the illuminating paper on "The Jesus of History," contributed by G. Kittel to *Mysterium Christi*.

The contents of Canon Quick's book were originally delivered as lectures to clergy. They are certainly well worth the study of clergy throughout the Church. They would form an admirable basis of discussion for a ruridecanal study circle. And if anyone should wish to make the book the starting-point of a more extended course of study, I would recommend him to follow it up by reading G. Kittel's paper just referred to, then to take one or two studies on Christ in History, such as Easton, *Christ in the Gospels*; and Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*; and with this preparation to tackle Fr. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*, the most thoroughgoing of recent attempts to meet Canon Quick's demand that "we ought to follow St. Paul in constructing with the help of the Cross a Christian philosophy of history."

LEONARD HODGSON.

CHRISTUS VICTOR. An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement. By Gustav Aulén. Authorized translation by A. G. Hebert. S.P.C.K. 6s.

It is the thesis of this interesting little book that there have been, and that there are, in the Christian tradition not two only, but three, main types of Atonement doctrine. There is,

in the first place, the view which is commonly associated with the name of Anselm, and which belongs in general to the "Latin" tradition in theology—the view which lays the whole emphasis upon the idea of an objective "satisfaction" as being rendered by Christ to the Father. There is, in the second place, the view which goes back to Abelard, but which was revived, in a modern form, by such "liberals" as the late Dr. Rashdall—the view which rests everything upon the idea of the Divine love, so powerfully shown forth in the Cross as to evoke from the human heart a repentance which can be, and is, freely met by the Divine gift of forgiveness. But there is also a third view—clearly to be distinguished from both the foregoing—to which (perhaps for the reason that it is in form less immediately easy to rationalize) neither the theologians nor the historians of dogma have done adequate justice. It is the view which operates with the idea (however in form mythological) of a decisive conflict of God with the dark forces of evil, and which discovers the heart of the Gospel in the triumphant proclamation of a Divine victory in Christ over the powers of Sin, Death, and the Devil.

"Mors et vita duello conflixere mirando:
Dux vitae mortuus, regnat vivus."

It is this third conception—the *Christus Victor* idea—which, regard being had to its prominence alike in the New Testament, in the writings of the Fathers, and (so Dr. Aulén, as a good Lutheran, is careful to add) in the theology of Luther, deserves really to be described as the "classic" Christian idea of the Atonement. It is not simply to be brushed aside as "mythology." It is deserving of serious and sympathetic study. It is genuinely and characteristically Christian. It requires to be understood, and its essential truth needs to be maintained. "For my own part," writes Dr. Aulén, "I am persuaded that no form of Christian teaching has any future before it except such as can keep steadily in view the reality of the evil in the world, and go to meet the evil with a battle-song of triumph. Therefore I believe that the classic idea of the Atonement and of Christianity is coming back—that is to say, the genuine, authentic Christian faith."

Dr. Aulén's work is in form and method historical—a contribution towards that "thorough revision" of the current interpretation of the history of dogma, especially in respect of the patristic period, which he rightly sees to be necessary. The learned world has been misled here by Harnack, whose monumental *History of Dogma* is now perceived to rest "rather on the presuppositions of nineteenth-century theology than on

an objective and unprejudiced analysis of the actual work of the Fathers." It is not the theology of the Greek Fathers, but the Latin theology of the period of Anselm and later, which for Dr. Aulén is the villain of the piece. "If our hypothesis is true," he writes, "the Latin type of Christian doctrine turns out to be really a side-track in the history of Christian dogma—admittedly of vast importance and influence, but still only a side-track; and the proud claim of Roman theology to represent the continuity of Christian doctrine cannot be substantiated. . . . The main line in the development of doctrine is continued, not by Anselm and the mediæval scholastics, but by Luther." Later Protestant orthodoxy unhappily reverted to the mediæval tradition, and in the controversies which ensued between the defenders of orthodoxy and the rationalizing theologians of the Enlightenment it was assumed on both sides that to be "orthodox" meant being committed to a "Latin" or Anselmic idea of the Atonement. In an atmosphere overshadowed and beclouded with controversy, the "classic" conception was not so much as considered. There were other causes also which contributed to this state of affairs. Dr. Aulén gives a list of them on pp. 23-29 of his book.

Dr. Aulén's purely historical chapters cannot here be considered in detail. They are concerned respectively with Irenæus, the Fathers in the East and West, the New Testament, the Middle Ages, Luther, and the period since the Reformation. In a final chapter, which sums up results, Dr. Aulén admits that while his book has sought to give an historical analysis, and not primarily to make an *apologia* for the "classic" idea, yet it has, in effect, been compelled to appear almost as a vindication of the latter as against its rivals. The common prejudice on the part of the theologians he believes to be shallow. The reproaches of "dualism" and of "demonological mythology" are not really the last word. The patristic writers employ, no doubt, highly bizarre and realistic imagery, in which Christ's victory over the devil, or the deception of the devil, is luridly depicted. But a serious attempt needs to be made to penetrate behind the outward form to the underlying idea. For the classic view represents rather an *idea* than a cut-and-dried theory. It is a question of a theme, a *motif*, which recurs in a number of differing variations. And this central *motif* is the victory of God.

If God is to conquer, He must have real enemies to overcome. The "classic" idea consequently involves the recognition of the reality, power, and malignity of moral and spiritual evil. It is in this sense "dualistic." It is not in a *metaphysical* sense dualistic, neither does it (with Zoroastrianism) regard

Good and Evil as coæval and co-eternal antagonists. It is dualistic in the sense in which Scripture is dualistic; evil is real, and the opposition between good and evil is radical—there is a real antagonism, an actual rebellion of created wills against their Creator; and yet, through it all, God remains Sovereign over His universe, and His victory is sure. The work of redemption is conceived in dramatic terms; and in the drama of salvation the supreme agent is God. There is a directness of Divine activity throughout. It is not simply that (as in the Latin view) the act of Atonement has its *origin* in the will of God; it is throughout a *continuous* Divine work. The legalistic idea of the necessity of a "satisfaction," an interpolated offering, made to God by Christ as man and on man's behalf, as a precondition of reconciliation, is in no way involved. Redemption is wholly a movement from God to man, *contra legem et contra rationem*; it proceeds wholly from God's free grace. The Incarnation and the Atonement are brought together as one process—the process of human redemption; and in the person of Christ the redemptive work is accomplished *by* the Godhead *through* the manhood as His instrument; it *could* be accomplished by no power but that of God Himself! The whole process, from first to last, is a continuous and sustained activity of the all-conquering power, mercy, and love of God, who in Christ reconciles both the world to Himself, and Himself to the world.

There are, of course, difficulties and paradoxes. Dr. Aulén pleads for the classic view, and would have men refuse to be repelled by its frequent crudeness of statement. There are those who will desire to plead analogously for the recognition of a core of truth in the "Latin" view. The idea of a Divine victory in Christ, and the recognition that that victory is wholly the work of the Divine love, and that God (and not simply Christ) is Himself continuously and victoriously active throughout the whole process and work of redemption—all this is, indeed, of quite primary importance, if there is to be any real understanding, on Christian lines, of what is meant by Atonement. But it does not quite follow that there is no room left for the complementary idea, somewhat crudely expressed by the Latin term *satisfactio*—the idea that, *in the context* of the victoriously redemptive sweep of the Divine love, and *as an actual element* in the Divine activity on behalf of man, there was rendered by Christ to the Father the one perfect oblation of a life wholly consecrated and dedicated in costly and flawless obedience, even unto death.

Nevertheless, one of Dr. Aulén's closing paragraphs is worth quoting. "If the classic idea," he writes, "of the Atonement ever again resumes a leading place in Christian theology, it is

not likely that it will revert to precisely the same forms of expression that it has used in the past; its revival will not consist in a putting back of the clock. It is the idea itself that will be essentially the same; the fundamental idea that the Atonement is, above all, a movement of God to man, not in the first place a movement of man to God. We shall hear again its tremendous paradoxes: that God, the all-ruler, the Infinite, yet accepts the lowliness of the Incarnation; we shall hear again the old, realistic message of the conflict of God with the dark, hostile forces of evil, and His victory over them by the Divine self-sacrifice; above all, we shall hear again the note of triumph."

On this note I might end; but a word must be added in praise of the illuminating and wholly admirable introduction which Fr. Hebert has prefixed to his translation of the book; and (because I hope for the book such a circulation as will make necessary a corrected reprint) I would draw attention to the facts that on p. 132 (line 1) the word "Hegelian" is misspelt as "Hagelian," and that on p. 168 (line 3 *ab imo*) a misprint ("makes" for "make") ruins the sense of a sentence.

A. E. J. RAWLINSON.

COMMUNICANTS' MANUALS

THE HILL OF THE LORD. By J. W. Hunkin. S.P.C.K. 1s.
THE HIDDEN GARDEN OF PRAYER. By E. D. Sedding, S.S.J.E. St. Christopher's Press and S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

It is customary to give to the newly confirmed a devotional book as a guide in the life of prayer and sacramental communion. Instruction on these matters will already have been given, and it is perhaps continued in class teaching after confirmation. A few people have the rare fortune to find a skilled spiritual guide from whom they receive spiritual direction. But the little book and an occasional sermon on prayer are the lot of most of our neophytes when they leave the confirmation class.

There are many such books. A church bookseller's shop will stack them in row upon row of long shelves. The very variety and multiplicity prove both the need and the very partial fulfilment of the need. It is foolish to put aside these little books with a lofty scorn, for they have helped immensely in the last hundred years of Church revival. But few priests are wholly content with the one they use for their confirmation work. The wise priest will always be on the look-out for a new and better book, and in particular will do well to examine any—such as the two good ones before us—which have passed the critical eye of the editorial secretary of S.P.C.K.

Archdeacon Hunkin's book is short and simple; it contains the Holy Communion Service with explanatory notes and suggested devotions, and it advises about private prayer. It has a quiet and sober piety, admirable lucidity in compact explanation, and its advice about prayer, based on the Bishop of Croydon's penny pamphlet (*How to Say Your Prayers*, S.P.C.K.), is sound and very well arranged. It contains a comparatively large body of well-chosen collects and sentences from scripture for devotional use. The theology is liberal evangelical, and is for the most part unobtrusive and never polemical. Sacramental confession is not even mentioned as a possibility, though it is difficult to see how that is consistent with Prayer Book churchmanship of any kind; and prayers for the dead are carefully evaded by the bowdlerizing of a prayer derived from the 1928 Prayer Book. The preparation for Communion is meagre. Some of the space occupied by collects could have been more profitably used in expanding the advice on other than intercessory prayer. An unassuming book, but for those who are content with its theological basis and devotional ideals it will prove one of the best of its kind.

Fr. Sedding's delicious little book is not primarily a companion at Holy Communion, but an introduction to the life of prayer for adolescents. It is very attractively printed and illustrated, and it has a pleasant vein of sentiment and imaginative fantasy. It attempts to supply immediate needs, but also to lead on to further stages in the prayer life. That deep personal knowledge of the spiritual life which has made Cowley holy ground for English Churchmen is here placed at the disposal of beginners with ease and grace and winning simplicity; and very many who have some experience of prayer, as well as beginners, will be grateful for it. It will be admirable for those adolescents (perhaps more particularly girls) who take to the prayer life easily. There is an excellent intercession scheme as well as the very valuable teaching on mental prayer.

Turning over the pages of these two books, I still find myself wanting something. I want another book, not pitched in so low a key as Archdeacon Hunkin's, yet rather more prosaic and less pretty than Fr. Sedding's. I want a book for the normal, football-playing, motor-biking English boy, a book uncompromisingly supernatural, and at the same time realist, matter-of-fact more than matter-of-feeling. The unhappy truth is that very few young Englishmen persevere seriously with prayer for long after their confirmation. What sort of a book might help to remedy that?

There are no absolute standards in the art of prayer. Prayer can be practised in more ways than any book can teach, and in

prayer we are bound to encourage the freedom of the individual soul to find its own way under the guidance of the Spirit. The prayer life, like matrimony, to which it has so often been compared by the masters, is the art of living with someone else; and you cannot learn that from a book. Prayer, like matrimony, depends mainly on whether you want very much to live with another person, and are ready to go on learning how to do it well. Prayer often issues from a sense of need, but such prayer is spasmodic and unstable. The Christian prayer life grows from loyalty and love. My ideal book must build on, and build up, those dispositions, carefully utilizing the movements of the soul stirred by the preparation for confirmation and communion and by the grace of these two sacraments. One need not, and in most cases, where the candidate has been Christianly brought up, one must not look for a catastrophic conversion of the sort beloved in American psychology-books.

The next thing I should look for is a realization in the mind of the compiler of the need for some measure of insight into dogmatic truth. A book that was vague or naturalistic, that talked much of life and fellowship and joy in service, that laid more emphasis on ethical abstractions than on worship, would probably fail me. Prayer, to be vigorous, needs insight into dogmatic truth. A boy will not be able to express himself in the precise language of theology, but if he is to go on praying he must grasp, however obscurely, that articulated body of facts summarized by the words, the reality of God, the mediation of Christ, and the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the Sacraments. He must be led to recognize them as facts first and foremost, not as inspiring ideas which his elders seem to find consoling and edifying. He must expect *not* to find religion a comfort; rather he must be led to approach religion as primarily the truth about God and man. Hence there must be a positive basis of supernatural doctrine, and in particular a doctrine of prayer as communion with, and exploration of, an invisible realm of really existent entities.

Prayer, so conceived, is an art to be learnt. Hence my book must be the work of a man versed in the science of prayer as it has been worked out by the great masters of the art during the Christian centuries. He must have digested the technique for himself and be capable of explaining it clearly and simply. The ordinary boy gets practically nothing from the great generalities about prayer as conversation with God, resting in God, and the like; nor will he find much help from pages of collects and litanies. He needs to be taught such things as how to use fifteen minutes in consecutive prayer, how to use

a few vocal prayers with intention, how to occupy the intervals of silence during the celebration of Holy Communion, how to meditate on a parable or saying from the Gospels.

This being done, he has to find help in his book for growth and freedom and variety, as his dealings with God lead him on in the prayer life. This cannot be done *in extenso* in our imaginary little book, but we can give some hints and warnings, and in particular we can introduce a very short and carefully chosen list of books for further reading. Our failure to make more use of the great spiritual classics in religious education is one of the barriers to religious advance in this country. Spiritual Philistinism will not give us a spiritually educated democracy.

Some will, of course, say that a book on these lines aims too high, and that normal boys are not capable of a prayer life of this kind, even if (some may even add) it were desirable. But this is mere faithlessness. God is real; the end of man is to know and love Him. Adolescence is not too early to begin. Nor is religion so dangerous for adolescents as some schoolmasters seem to imagine; the pious morbidity of which they are often afraid is the result of bad training and wrong emphases in religious teaching and example. And these things can be avoided.

H. BALMFORTH.

NOTICES

THE HOLY AND THE LIVING GOD. By M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. Allen and Unwin. 10s.

Miss Willink has written a very unequal book. It contains a great deal of valuable material, for she has collected and arranged in a very competent manner the Old Testament evidence concerning what was held "holy" among the Jews, and has compared this with the similar elements in surrounding religions. The result is to exhibit the superiority of Judaism from what we may perhaps call the standpoint of common sense. But she is so carried away by a current fashion in theological speculation that her judgments on the evidence are often curiously perverse. It may be that certain thinkers of the penultimate period in theology were over-enamoured of a sentimental conception of an easy-going God; but the equally sentimental reaction in favour of a God unworthy on opposite grounds of man's worship has little, if anything, more to commend it, as Canon Quick has recently shown in his *The Ground of Faith and Chaos of Thought*. Miss Willink is fond of referring to the parallel between the danger of approaching the numinous God and that of approaching a live electric wire, and seems to favour the view that God's holy "life" is something best conceived after such an analogy, so that He "cannot" prevent its "breaking forth" destructively on those who even inadvertently come in contact with it improperly insulated. Has it ever occurred

to her that this reliance on an analogy from the sub-personal involves her in the same position as those thinkers for whom God is tied and bound by "natural laws"? Probably not, for her most provoking characteristic is a refusal to face any such problems. Instead, she evades them by couching her remarks in the form of questions, which she asks with the innocent air of the man who prefaces his barbed shot with the words, "I am only asking for information." This habit of evasion reaches its climax on page 148, when she writes: "Whether there is sufficient connection to justify further investigation must of course be a matter of opinion." It would be interesting to know by what *method* of investigation she thinks the enquiry suggested might profitably be carried out.

This brief notice has been mainly occupied with criticism, but I do not wish it to be thought that the book is without value. The last two chapters, with their stimulating summary of the place of the Cross in the history of Christianity, go far to make up for whatever shortcomings have gone before. But when Miss Willink has forced herself to face squarely the issues she has in this book treated too lightly, her expert knowledge of the material of the history of religion will enable her to write a much more satisfactory book than this venture.

LEONARD HODGSON.

PLATO AND HIS DIALOGUES. By G. Lowes Dickinson. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

Broadcast lectures by experts in their subject published as books are often the best introduction to a subject. The lecturer has to be terse, he has to be intelligible at all costs, he has to leave out nothing essential. And so Mr. Lowes Dickinson's *Plato and his Dialogues* is one of the best windows into the world of Plato. Here the wayfaring man will see what the Athens of Socrates was like, what Socrates was at, why he had to die, and why Plato made him his hero; he will also get some insight into the mind of the supreme writer, who has had especial influence on the great thinkers of our own Church. But perhaps the most useful thing in this short treatment of Plato is, as in the famous Balliol lectures of R. L. Nettleship, the insistent comparison of Plato's time with our own, and the recognition of the similarity of the problems that he and we have to face, which are as imperfectly solved today as then. The passages used as illustrations from the *Phædrus*, the *Republic*, and the *Symposium* are admirably chosen, and give the right touch of charm, which should induce the reader to seek for more. That will not be a difficult search, for Plato is one of the best translated of the Greeks; and if someone should learn Greek in order to read Plato, "his time," as Mr. Lowes Dickinson says, "will not be wasted. For there is no language known to us more perfect, and no writer more supreme than Plato."

W. J. FERRAR.

THROUGH THE EAST TO ROME. By G. J. MacGillivray. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

Father MacGillivray was in earlier life a member of the Archbishop's Assyrian Mission, and he attributes his conversion in part to his experiences in the Near East. But he would not himself probably lay very much stress on this factor. His book is an exceptionally able and persuasive setting forth of the usual argument for the need of an infallible

guide. "If God meant us all to believe one body of truth revealed by Him, He must have provided some teaching body which is able to teach the truth, and to decide disputed questions." *Debuit, ergo fecit.* But, says our author, there is only one claimant to such a position. Therefore the only thing to do is to submit to that claimant, and to all her claims. But, of course, the author would not deny that it is reasonable to see what that would in fact commit us to: because if there should come a point at which we can only say *Quod absurdum est*, we must reserve the right to reconsider our acceptance. It is here that the ice gets rather thin. The existence of the Orthodox Churches does in fact reduce very considerably the claim of Roman Catholicism to be the sole legatee of the authoritative Apostolic Church, and their growing readiness to recognize the Anglican Communion involves Father MacGillivray in something of a contradiction. On the one hand he has to represent them as "fossilized and moribund," having nothing to say on any question which has arisen since A.D. 787; but on the other he asserts that, should they cease to regard the Church of England as schismatical and heretical, they will have abandoned their historic position and principles. Moreover, the attitude of the Holy See to the matter of Biblical criticism is a real difficulty. How can it be right to give "interior assent" to statements which are denied by all scholars who are free to do so?

The book is largely written in the familiar tone of bland amazement at the invincibility of Anglican ignorance: but it is never discourteous and never unfair. Altogether a very favourable specimen of controversial writing.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

ENGLISH EDUCATION UNDER THE TEST ACTS. By H. McLachlan, D.D. Manchester University Press. 12s. 6d.

The story of the English "Academies" is an interesting chapter in the educational life of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By the renewal of the Act of Uniformity (1662), and by the statutes of the Universities, Dissenters, whether students or tutors, were excluded from Oxford and Cambridge. An attempt to provide a suitable education for the sons of the ejected ministers, and for those of similar outlook, was made by the founding of these colleges. In his recent book, *English Education under the Test Acts*, Dr. McLachlan describes the origin of the academies which began as domestic foundations, personally controlled. He traces their development during a period when their doctrinal position was guided by external societies of Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists and Calvinists, and their transition to institutions with specific bodies of trustees and subscribers. In the later stages the distinction between the Unitarian establishments and the evangelicals became more marked, and the latter gradually changed their academies into theological colleges for the training of the ministry.

In his well-arranged and fascinating study, Dr. McLachlan indicates the type of curriculum in use, and compares the ideals and results with those of contemporary Oxford and Cambridge. He outlines the history of many of the academies, including Newington Green, Manchester, Hoxton and Findern. As one reviews his excellent list of tutors and students one realizes that Samuel Wesley, John Dalton, Philip Doddridge and others of equal distinction were trained at such institutions. During

a time when the older Universities were appallingly inefficient, these colleges earned the right to be called "centres of learning."

The volume is illustrated by numerous plates, and the author has given us the result of his son's research and his own amongst the first sources for the period. It is an interesting book and a real contribution to the educational history of the period.

L. F. CHURCH.

THE RELIGION OF MASONRY: AN INTERPRETATION. By Joseph Fort Newton, D.Litt. Allen and Unwin. 5s.

Freemasonry is regarded with a certain amount of suspicion by many religious people. This is due to the fact that it is supposed to claim to be a religion, or a substitute for religion. A pamphlet recently issued bears the title, *The Menace of Freemasonry to the Christian Faith.* Dr. Fort Newton's book shows that Freemasonry "is not the rival of any religion, but the friend of all." Freemasonry does not claim to be a religion, but it is definitely religious. Dr. Newton shows how belief in God is the very foundation of Masonry; how Masons are taught to practise moral and social virtues, and to look forward to and prepare for a future life. The book should be of interest both to Masons and non-Masons: to Masons as interpreting the successive stages and symbolism of their craft, and to non-Masons as meeting and correcting prevalent misconceptions. The book contains some passages of real beauty, and is carefully written. But in two cases proper names are incorrectly given—Professors Romanes and Frazer appear as "Romaine" and "Frazier."

G. H. PERRY.

THE MOFFATT NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY: THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Foakes-Jackson has made a brave effort to fulfil an impossible task. A volume of this size is no doubt sufficient for a commentary on a Pauline Epistle: but 236 pages is inadequate for a satisfactory treatment of a long and difficult book like Acts on the lines of these commentaries. He tells us in his preface that the book is designed "not for specialists, but for those readers who require a plain statement of the contents of the Acts of the Apostles." We cannot help wondering if such readers will not often be bewildered by the inevitably sketchy treatment of the complicated problems which Acts present. The introduction is a model of compression, and the general handling of the text only makes us wish for a fuller exposition. We may draw attention to the treatment of the Resurrection as involving for the Jews "an imminent world catastrophe" (p. 32), and to the insistence on the "amazing variety" of ancient cities (p. 158). These are typical of fresh and interesting points brought out in the commentary. We are promised on p. 101 a discussion of the different visits paid to Jerusalem by St. Paul, but we look for it in vain when we reach Chapter XV. There is no clear statement that it is at least possible that the second visit recorded in Galatians was not the Council visit, and so there is no contradiction between Galatians and Acts.

Readers who have some acquaintance with the New Testament will

find much that is stimulating in this book, and will appreciate the desire of the commentator to bring out the value of Acts considered as an artistic whole.

E. J. BICKNELL.

A MANUAL FOR CONFESSORS. By F. G. Belton. New and revised edition. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 8s. 6d.

THE PRIEST IN THE CONFESSIONAL. Edited by J. F. Briscoe. Faith Press. 2s.

The former of these books is a thoroughly revised and in some parts enlarged edition of a book first issued in 1916. Its appearance and size are also much improved. The latter consists of the papers read at a Convention of Priests held in London last May. The more important of the papers are by Dr. Kirk and Father Tribe, S.S.M.

Since Canon Belton's book was first issued, a great deal of water has run under the bridges. For one thing, the use of the Sacrament of Penance has much increased, a new generation has grown up which looks upon Confession as quite a normal state of things, a certain amount of the old prejudice against it is dying away, the science of Psychology has made considerable strides, and last, but not least, the beginnings of systematic study of Moral Theology from the Anglican point of view have come about, of which the most important are the works of Dr. Kirk. The average parish priest who regularly hears Confessions knows how ill-equipped he is as a rule for his task. It is not altogether his fault; his training at his theological college was already over-full, and experts in such matters do not abound even in theological colleges.

Then, when he gets to his work, time is all too short even for the work that cries out to be done. This is not to say that he ought not to read, and read adequately, on what is after all one of the principal parts of his work, but the added difficulty is that most of the books are Roman ones, which are not very modern as a rule, and deal with a set of circumstances differing in a good many respects from those in which he finds himself. To all such, then, Canon Belton's works are invaluable, for he puts in simple form, and in a way adapted to our needs, the lessons he has himself learnt from other writers and his own great experience. The new matter in this edition is a good illustration of his awareness of modern problems and thought; the chapter on the Confessions of boys and girls faces their modern habits and temptations, and gives wise, if rather drastic, advice. He deals also with the question of Psycho-analysis, and concludes that it has little in common with the methods of the Confessional. On this point it will be well to compare with Canon Belton's conclusions Father Tribe's paper in our second book, which shows how the study of Psychology may be a real help in dealing with souls. It would have been, perhaps, an advantage if Canon Belton had given us rather more fully his views on Psychology as distinct from Psycho-analysis. But the book is of real value, and should be in the hands of all who hear Confessions.

Dr. Kirk has also some strong criticisms on the danger of Psychological ways of viewing things, and his paper in the second of these books deserves, needless to say, great attention. For the danger and the difficulty with which the parish priest has to deal in such matters is not just with scientific thought, as expressed in the writings of real thinkers,

but rather with the loose use of psychological ideas and jargon which filters through to his people viâ the newspapers and cheap literature.

A. H. Howe Brown.

Ecclesiastical Greek for Beginners. By J. E. Lowe. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

This little volume contains an elementary course in Greek, mainly for readers who desire to read, "if not with ease, at least with understanding," the New Testament in the original. It reminds one somewhat of the old *Principia Græca*, by William Smith; only in this exercises are largely taken from the Greek of the New Testament, or are at least based on it. The introductory matter to the exercises, containing the necessary Grammar, with examples chosen to illustrate the rules, seems to have been well and carefully done; and we believe that anyone who will consciously work through the whole book may, in six months, acquire quite enough Greek to tackle the Synoptic Gospels with confidence. The vocabularies are brief but sufficient. This volume, though unpretentious, is deserving of commendation.

E. H. Blakeney.

Studies in Early Roman Liturgy. I. The Kalendar. By Walter Howard Frere, C.R., D.D., Bishop of Truro. Alcuin Club Collections, No. XXVIII. Oxford, London: Humphrey Milford. 21s.

Slightly more than half of the Bishop's Essay is given to a painstaking examination of the source material available for the investigation involved. The Second Part is a running commentary on the Feasts of the Kalendar, according to their actual appearance in the Christian Year. It is difficult to appraise this work: it is the result of pioneering exploration; it presents the facts with the minimum of interpretation; and it is tantalizing for the very suggestive allusiveness of references and comments. Perhaps the most astonishing effect upon the reader is his discovery of the comparatively rapid elaboration of the Kalendar from great simplicity to a complexity responding to the diverse devotional needs of a varied population. As Dr. Frere tells us, "the Old Roman Kalendar had at first no feast of the Blessed Virgin, nor any commemoration of the greater number of the Apostles." The progressive elaboration of the apparatus for celebrating such feasts supplied the deficiency.

In two respects the study of the Roman Kalendar can be made to yield a rich commentary on Church History. The theological changes sustained by the liturgical texts due to the same pressure of felt need on the part of piety are of great importance for the history of the Kalendar. K. Adam's study of Augustinian Eucharistic doctrine and Geiselmann's *Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* shed much light on the syncretism of the Roman Use as it gradually spread in the West by virtue of its sensitiveness to the demands of devotion and growth by accretion. Similarly the history of Church music can be used as a means both to control and to explain the development of the Kalendar. Local Roman Use extended its sway chiefly because of its resilient adaptability, an adjustment not necessarily logical or premeditated, but dominated by the progressive awareness of the value of practices achieving the satisfaction of spiritual needs, through which undoubtedly arose in part the growth of ecumenical consciousness. We look forward with eagerness to the Bishop's further

studies, which should contribute as much to our understanding of the development of the Roman Church in the West as to our appreciation of the motives and means of that growth.

F. GAVIN.

WHITHER? A STUDY OF SHAMS AND SAFEGUARDS. By the Rev. the Hon. Edward Lyttelton, D.D. John Murray. 7s. 6d.

A book by Dr. Lyttelton always commands respectful attention, and the wide scope of this present work renders it of considerable interest and importance. The first chapters contain a masterly diagnosis of the disease which is paralyzing modern Christianity—*e.g.*, "double-mindedness"—a verbal recognition of the Cross without a corresponding acceptance of crucifixion, individual and social. The author goes on to deal with popular Christian Ethics, showing that in the various relationships of life man is sinning and suffering in a vicious circle because he persistently ignores the injunction to seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness. In two controversial chapters which one found the least convincing in the book, Dr. Lyttelton treats of Eternal Judgment, and gives grounds for belief in a personal Devil. It is particularly evident in this connection that he is not prepared to press the "kenotic" theory to any very radical conclusion. His views on Eternal Judgment, like those of Cardinal Newman, postulate a highly individualistic conception of the human soul, not easily reconcilable with the new psychology. The ancient Catholic doctrine of the treasury of merits seems to be in better accordance with modern scientific pronouncements on the mental and physical solidarity of the race.

Dr. Lyttelton devotes his concluding chapters to a study of the safeguards provided by the Church. Prayer, Sacraments, Bible Reading, Asceticism are dealt with on more or less conventional lines. One sentence stands out:

"Between us and the Saints there is no chasm which has to be overleapt, but an uphill road to be trodden in ever-growing faith and love."

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

A PARSON'S JOB. By L. S. Hunter, Archdeacon of Northumberland. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

In the Church Assembly Report of the Commission on the Staffing of Parishes, one whole section is devoted to the "Supply of Ordinands." In that section is a summary of the answers given by five headmasters of public schools of different types, an ex-headmaster and a school chaplain, to various questions with regard to the obstacles in the way of the younger generation in offering themselves as candidates for ordination. Section iii. of that summary contains such remarks as these: "In the report of the Lambeth Conference (1930) on youth, service in the ministry is described 'as a man's job.' This several . . . take leave to doubt, at least as the 'job' is seen through the eyes of the public school boy." "The parson's job seems to them no job for a man." "It would be a help if a book were written on this subject . . . proving and illustrating that the work . . . is a man's job."

Perhaps Archdeacon Hunter has met the need. So at any rate we hoped. Here is a book by a man of varied experience; perhaps this is just the very thing needed to put into the hands of young men to show them

that a Parson's Job *is* a man's job. We could very much wish this was the needed book, but we are afraid it isn't. Much more constructive than the *Impatience of a Parson*, it nevertheless shares much of the impatience and much of the view-point of that book, and so far as the "setting" of our work, or the difficulty of the present position and future prospect is concerned, an ordinary layman—for whom very largely, according to the preface, the book is written—will learn a great deal to which he may well give earnest attention. The Introduction is, in fact, the best part of the book, and we are especially glad to notice that the Archdeacon's picture of the Church of England as she might be is that of one tree with, maybe, three main boughs, and not of three separate trees in one field, separate except in so far as their roots are intermingled, which would apparently satisfy so many of the extremists in the Catholic, Liberal, or Evangelical "parties."

But the book lacks an underlying unity, especially when the author comes to tell us his constructive suggestions. One of those suggestions especially might surely, if only it were pushed to its logical conclusions, provide the necessary unifying idea. The Archdeacon is pleading for the establishment of a "Parochial Communion" at some hour between nine and ten on Sunday morning. This Family Eucharist—as we should prefer to call it—held at an hour when fasting Communion is still perfectly practicable—is becoming in many parishes the central act of worship on Sundays, and it is admirable that that should be so. But it all depends on the creation of a real feeling of family life in a parish; that very life of the fellowship which the Book of Common Prayer so continually urges on our attention, and which is the central unifying idea of all that a parish priest aims at, and which would give this book a unity it at present lacks. The same family idea means that the Eucharist, as the family meal of fellowship with God and man—we are glad the Archdeacon pleads for the latter to be more recognized—must become the central service of the parish's life. It follows that the need for "special services," on which the author is so keen, disappears. The Mass *is* the ideal service for every occasion—that is one of its many marvels—and special services either for odd occasions (or, *e.g.*, for children on Sundays) become unnecessary when such a centre of family life becomes realized. We agree heartily with the author when he pleads for a Special Service to be something special and not just garbled Evensong. The Archdeacon, moreover, justifies his plea by the printing of some "Special Services" at the end of the book.

The author touches on many other topics in many cases quite unconnected with each other. Music, the Care of a Church, Church Schools, Training, the 1928 Prayer Book—these and many other subjects are passed rapidly under review, and on all of them the Archdeacon has some useful things to say, but we could wish he had a firmer grasp of the idea of family life and a greater appreciation of liturgical worship.

C. PATTESON.

SCEPTICISM AND CONSTRUCTION. Bradley's sceptical principle as the basis of constructive philosophy. By Charles A. Campbell. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Campbell's book teems with considerations of the most vital concern regarding truth and reality, and not even a short notice would be adequate which did not seek to direct readers to the work itself.

It must be all to the good for present-day philosophers to be reminded that there were great men before Agamemnon, and it is certainly refreshing to be called back to Bradley. In the prevailing anarchy of thought, good will result if it is realized that the philosopher is not "an odd-job man" in the field of knowledge. Mr. Campbell has no affinity with Bishop Berkeley's "minute philosopher"—he deals on the grand scale with ultimate issues, and has written a book which will command attention.

Mr. Campbell isolates Bradley's radical scepticism from other features of his philosophical outlook. He lifts a general characteristic of our knowledge into a description of our knowledge of reality in itself and even into an account of that reality—thus he sets the lists for a thoroughgoing epistemological joust. His use of Mr. Bradley's conceptions will prompt a question as to whether his criticisms and applications are valid, and also as to the matter of knowledge of reality in itself. The elements in Mr. Bradley's theory of knowledge which are here modified or rejected may be formally inconsistent, but they are features in a total-view which reinstate themselves; it is tempting to add that they do so quite definitely in Mr. Campbell's more constructive conclusions. If, indeed, there are "final phenomenal truths," the mere fact of the relation of knowledge to a knower fails to establish the radical inconsistency of knowledge in itself. The structure of thought declares itself in the system of appearances—this much is implied in the possibility of critical philosophy, and in consequence we should give more sanction to the scientific approach to knowledge than Mr. Campbell allows.

The more constructive elements in this volume include an acute discussion and vindication of the "libertarian" view of the will. There is also an argued preference for the idea of Supra-personality in the Absolute as against concepts of process or substance; the context of these preferences raises the question of the relation of his constructive affirmations to his epistemological base and of axiology as a condition of intelligibility. There seems to be an unjustifiable use of the principle of non-contradiction in his notion of the "supra-rational" God and in general of his use of the criterion of "satisfyingness" in religion. A good deal, however, must be excused to those who help out their irrationalism in religion by reference to Rudolf Otto, though it would not be wise to be too confident that there is any real concord between Mr. Campbell's supra-rational God and the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*.

F. W. BUTLER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD